

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1881.

The Week.

THIS has been a great week for "politics." In fact, we can recall no week for several years containing so much naked, unadorned "politics." In other words, both here and in Washington, there has been a stoppage of the most pressing public business in order that the persons charged with the conduct of it might have a good long tussle over "offices." The Committee of Twenty-One, appointed at the indignation meeting of which we spoke a fortnight ago, procured the passage of a bill in the State Senate putting the whole street-cleaning business into the hands of the Mayor. By the time it reached the Assembly the Republican politicians had roused themselves, and, perceiving that this would give the Mayor a number of offices of which the Republicans have hitherto had the control, got it amended in committee so as to put the business into the hands of Professor Chandler, the President of the Board of Health. Professor Chandler promptly announced that he would under no circumstances accept it, and, as no one else offers who can be conveniently substituted for the wicked and designing Democratic Mayor, the bill is at this moment hanging fire in the Assembly, in spite of the general indignation of the people who live on the streets to be cleaned. Among its opponents at Albany has appeared Mr. George Bliss, our old reforming friend, who evidently thinks that dirty streets can never present a spectacle so dreadful as streets cleaned by Democrats. The chances are, however, that the bill will eventually be passed as it came from the Senate. The whole affair is an excellent illustration not simply of "politics," but of the way in which the possession of the State Legislature by one party and of the city government by another makes good municipal administration impossible. There is no cure for it but the insertion of the city charter, or the leading provisions of it, in the State constitution, giving the city government to the people of the city. The politicians of both parties are demented about offices, and have actually lost all notion of office as a trust for the benefit of the whole population. They think of it simply as a means of giving "workers" the spending of some money, and have now got to the point of avowing this view with the simplicity of savages or insane persons who go about naked without shame.

The Mayor has, however, turned "politics" into business by summoning the Police Commissioners for trial before him on a long string of charges brought against them as street-cleaners. The principal one is, of course, that they did not clean the streets, and this they cannot deny, but simply confess and avoid. The others are that they allowed garbage and rubbish to be illegally mixed; that they have made false returns of the work actually done by them; that they allowed the public scows to be used for the transportation of private rubbish; that they employed unfit men and horses; that they kept on the pay-rolls the names of men who did no work for the city; that they allowed ash and garbage men to extort payment for their services from private citizens, and foremen and inspectors to extort payment from laborers for making false returns of the time spent in the municipal service; that they have cheated grossly in their charge for horse-feed; that they have permitted garbage and manure to be emptied into the river instead of being taken out to sea, and so on. On the very same day the Grand Jury presented the Commissioners also for having made appointments in the street-cleaning service "from political considerations, and without regard to the personal fitness of the appointees"; for hiring scows at an extravagant price, and then allowing them to be employed in transporting private dirt, and the inspectors to receive payment for the same, and so on. In fact, the charges against the Commissioners are that they are "politicians" engaged actively in the practice of "politics." If these charges are true, they have been simply doing in a grosser and more mischievous way what all the

Federal officers are and have been doing. They have been carrying on what a good many people, like ex-Governor Rice, of Massachusetts, call "the American system" of administration, and what others call "rotation in office," and others "the spoils system." There is a good deal of it in Congress, in all the departments, and in all the custom-houses and post-offices. In these it keeps up an appearance of decency, but of course when it is applied to New York street-cleaning it throws off all disguise and becomes coarse and repulsive. If the Commissioners were wise they would reply boldly that the daily and continuous cleaning of streets by able-bodied men was a monarchical practice; that the objection to heaps of garbage at the front door was a piece of aristocratic fastidiousness; that the confinement of the scows to the city service was opposed to American habits and traditions, and that in allowing the scavengers to blackmail the householders, and the foremen to blackmail the scavengers, they were carrying out the great American system of "assessments," without which no true and healthy political activity would exist.

The United States Senate pegs away at "politics" with as much naïveté as Mr. George Bliss. The President, too, is having plenty of "politics" in trying to fill the offices. The plan of satisfying everybody with something—or, in other words, of treating the administration of the Government as a sort of Christmas-tree, with bon-bons for all his little friends hanging on the branches—is not succeeding. He has not adhered to the good rule which apparently guided him in making Mr. James's appointment, viz., that the efficient conduct of the Government business should be his main consideration, and that "politics" should come afterwards. His troubles, curiously enough, have not come from the Cabinet appointments, where vacancies *had* to be filled, but—and we commend this to those who think that it will be easy to secure permanence in office without imposing any restrictions on the manner of appointment—from subordinate appointments to vacancies deliberately, and apparently unnecessarily, created by himself in order to make a little excitement for the politicians. In the solicitor-generalship there was an able and competent lawyer, Mr. Phillips—of such standing as to be talked of for the bench of the Supreme Court. He has been dismissed, as far as one can see, solely for the purpose of making way for Mr. William E. Chandler, to oblige Mr. Blaine. Mr. Chandler is only a lawyer in name. He is really a claim-agent and lobbyist, and a notorious intriguer and wirepuller. Moreover, he was nominated to the place without the knowledge or consent of his superior, the Attorney-General, Mr. Wayne MacVeagh, who is naturally so much chagrined, first by Chandler *per se*, and then by the manner of Chandler's selection, that he will resign if he is confirmed. So here there is a world of—humanly speaking—wholly unnecessary trouble created by making a vacancy in an important legal office to accommodate a man who has no professional standing.

Judge Robertson's appointment to the Collectorship at this port is another illustration of the same thing. Whatever his merits or character may be—and we have nothing to say against either—his nomination was pure "politics." It has had no reference to the Government service. The causes are obscure, but it is plain enough that improvement in the administration is not among the number. A vacancy was made for Judge Robertson by dismissing Mr. Merritt from the Collectorship before the expiration of his term, evidently without any fault having been found with him, for he has been transferred to a different branch of the service. Now, one would have imagined from President Garfield's inaugural address that the great civil-service abuse was the arbitrary removal of officers before the term for which they were appointed had expired, and that nothing would prevent this but legislation. But here he has himself removed an officer in the middle of his term without charges. No act of Congress compelled him to do so, and we need hardly say that no act of Congress was necessary to restrain him from doing so. In fact, a better illustration of the emptiness, or, to use a Carlylism, of the "putrescent cant," of most of the

talk of the Presidential helplessness towards civil-service abuses, could hardly have been supplied. It is said in some quarters that Mr. Robertson's appointment means "war" on Conkling. Now, we are in favor of "war" on Conkling, but we do not think it ought to be carried on at the expense of the public business, or with Conkling's own weapons. Conkling cannot be beaten at his own game, any more than the devil can be successfully fought with fire. The thing the devil really fears and flies from is not fire but holy water, and the thing that Conkling fears, and which will finally ruin his trade and, if it comes in his lifetime, drive him out of politics, is the inflexible adherence of the Administration to business principles in the management of the various Federal offices in this State.

The Washington correspondents during the week thought they saw a gleam of repentance on the part of the Senate Republicans, but it was smothered in caucus, and, as the Democratic patience seems equal to their perversity, the session promises to be indefinitely prolonged. We have had, according to the principal orator, a Mahone day, a Hill day, a Kellogg day, a Lamar day, with the Massachusetts Senators filling in the interstices. General Mahone's speech fell flat. The best of all, and one of uncommon frankness, sobriety, and true perspective, was that delivered by Mr. Hill, who bore all interruptions meekly and dodged nothing. Messrs. Hoar and Dawes raked up the old stories of outrage at the South and waved them aloft once more, the latter telling the sad story of a Northern settler just returning from Mississippi a refugee after fifteen years of struggle and persecution, an "old, grey-headed man." Senator George, of Mississippi, called for the name of this man, whose "factories were burned, his employees murdered, and his enterprises thwarted at every step"; but Mr. Dawes rebuked him with great severity for such unseemly curiosity, telling him plainly that that was "the old way of meeting this thing, to call for names." He did not "intend to furnish an opportunity for further persecution and further destruction of property." Mr. George said he had never heard of a factory in Mississippi burned, and that there were but two or three in the State, so that a burning was something of a circumstance; nor had he ever "heard of any man's factory hands having been interfered with, much less murdered." He ended by shocking the Senate with his belief that "there is not a single particle of truth in the relation which the Senator [Dawes] received from his informant."

We were not at all surprised to see Mr. Dawes, in the course of the debate last week, figuring as the champion not only of the principle of majority rule but of civil-service reform. "I assure the Senator," he said to Mr. Pendleton, apropos of the Democratic "clean sweep" of two years ago, "that just as soon as we can recover from that unwise departure on the part of the then majority in the Senate, we shall adhere with all the persistency that a majority is authorized by the Constitution to adhere, to the very sound doctrines that the Senator has promulgated to-day." This was a tolerably impudent pledge on behalf of a majority known to be hostile to reform, and the joke about beginning the reform with a batch of partisan appointments whose permanence was to be insured hereafter by an appeal to the "very sound doctrines" which Mr. Dawes has as much at heart as Mr. Pendleton, was stupendous. The drunkard's last debauch before signing the pledge, or the gambler's last use of loaded dice before settling down to fair play, hardly excites a smile in comparison. Mr. Dawes, however, had given himself away, for being asked by Mr. Maxey, of Texas, why, if he was bent on restoring the *status quo*, he did not restore Sergeant-at-Arms French, he found it convenient to dodge on the first day, and on the next to answer that Mr. French was "now engaged in such responsible and arduous duties as render it impossible to take him from them without damage to the public service." Mr. Maxey unfeelingly asked whether Mr. French had been consulted about this, but Mr. Dawes replied that "the public good was consulted." So it seems that poetic justice is sometimes to be tempered by general considerations of the public good. One cannot help reflecting how much vituperation Mr. Dawes might have foregone if he had allowed this principle in the case of Mr. Schurz and the Poncas.

Mr. Pearson has signalized his accession to the postmastership in this city by making numerous changes—consolidations, removals, pro-

motions, and transfers—as well as by enlarging his force with forty-five new clerks. No outside observer is competent to criticise these arrangements, and there is every reason for taking Mr. Pearson at his word when he says that they were made with an eye single to the efficiency of his administration. He has addressed to his employees an excellent and business-like circular, insisting that the reputation of the office acquired under Mr. James must be maintained, and conveying his assurance that he proposes no departure from the principles which governed his predecessor in respect to appointments, promotions, and removals. On the following day, in fact, the new clerks were obliged to pass the civil-service examinations, and to undergo medical inspection, besides offering the usual recommendations as to character. It appears, therefore, that Mr. Pearson's public declarations are all right, and that, so far as can be judged, his acts are in strict conformity with them. It is impossible to overrate the importance of preserving intact the successful example of the application, in the first post-office of the country, of principles fundamentally opposed to the spoils system, and consequently to the traditions and practices of the country for the past fifty years. The public is little affected by references to the ante-Jacksonian views of the civil service, but it cannot overlook or explain away so conspicuous an embodiment of them as Mr. James has afforded, and Mr. Pearson aims to afford it. The value of the illustration, too, is doubled by its semi-Federal, semi-municipal aspect, so that in time we ought to see our committees of Seventy and of One Hundred and of Twenty-One resolved on effecting the elimination of politics from every department of city government.

Foreign specie continues to pour into New York, the arrivals during the week having been about \$4,000,000. From January 1 to April 1 the arrivals amounted to about \$14,000,000 against \$2,650,000 last year; and since last August about \$86,000,000 has arrived here against about \$81,000,000 a year ago. The rates for foreign exchange are still favorable for further specie imports, and the Custom-house returns of merchandise, imports and exports, show that while the imports in the last four months have fallen off 15 per cent. as compared with last year, the exports have increased about 12½ per cent.; in figures what is called the trade-balance is, for the last four months reported, \$70,000,000 more in favor of the United States than a year ago. The movement of securities between this country and Europe is not recorded either at the Custom-house or elsewhere, but it is safe to say that for the four months the export of securities much exceeds the import. There is accordingly strong reason why specie imports should show an increase, although it is likely that the leading European banks, notably the Bank of France, will resist more actively than a year ago the movement of specie to this country. Secretary Windom visited New York during the week to hear suggestions as to what the Treasury should do respecting the maturing debt of the Government. He was waited upon by many representative business men, from whom he is said to have obtained suggestions which he values. He has not yet made known precisely what he will do, although it is understood that he will depend upon the sale of the \$105,000,000 4 or 4½ per cent. bonds and upon surplus revenues, which together should give him about \$200,000,000 of cash this year with which to pay off maturing bonds. The remaining bonds, it is now expected, will be extended at a lower rate of interest. At the Stock Exchange it was a dull week, and general trade is also backward on account of the weather.

The failure of the lower House of the Austrian Reichsrath to join in the manifestations of sympathy which the tragic end of Alexander II. has evoked from the other parliamentary bodies of Europe has been construed into an anti-Russian demonstration on the part of Cisleithan Austria, for which some of her philo-Russian journals have loudly, though somewhat illogically, demanded the resignation of the Austro-Hungarian Minister of Foreign Affairs, Baron Haymerle. In reality, however, this negative action of the Reichsrath is not even expressive of the sentiments of the majority of its own members with regard to the death of the Czar, but simply the result of the endless party strifes and jealousies which abound in the parliamentary life of Austria to such an extent as almost to constitute it. Of the three principal elements of the Reichsrath, the German, Czech, and Polish, the last consistently opposed

any manifestation of sympathy with the Romanoffs, threatening its withdrawal from the sitting if the question were put to the vote, and by its firmness overawed the apparently harmonious sentiments of the Germans and Czechs. No sooner, however, had the club of the *Verfassungspartei*—the German constitutionalists—adopted resolutions of condolence than the ardor of the Czechs, which had been longing for utterance in the Reichsrath, perceptibly cooled, slavish imitation of German precepts being, of course, out of the question. Their indignation at the attitude of the Poles meanwhile had not abated, and found vent in vigorous denunciation of the principal leader of the Poles, Dr. Smolka, who, on the day following the assassination of the Czar, succeeded the German Constitutionalist, Count Coronini, as President of the Reichsrath. Nor were German voices wanting which regretted that Dr. Smolka, in his new capacity, did not see fit to sink the Polish patriot in the Austrian statesman. The *Neue Freie Presse*, the most eloquent organ of the *Verfassungspartei*, could easily put up with Smolka's anti-Russian proclivities, were it only inclined to tolerate Smolka himself. For the party whose spokesman it is finds at present Polish aggression from within more intolerable than Russian aggression from without; and the election of a Pole as President of the Reichsrath, together with that of the Czech feudalists, Prince Lobkowitz, and the Slovene, Baron Gödel-Lannoy, as Vice-Presidents, has reduced the once all-powerful *Verfassungspartei* to a momentarily impotent minority. However opinion may differ as to the wisdom of Count Taaffe's federalistic experiments and the Slavic preponderance in his Cabinet, the old *Verfassungspartei*, by its uncompromising opposition to all Slavic claims, has probably for ever forfeited its claim to reign exclusively in the councils of Cisleithan Austria.

The new Czar has made a sort of beginning of representative government by the creation of a council of twenty-five householders, elected by householders, to assist the military commandant in managing the city of St. Petersburg. The process of election was a novel one. It was arranged that the police should go about from house to house on a certain day and collect the votes, and a proclamation was issued requesting the voters to stay at home to receive them and record their votes. The inhabitants in many of the poorer quarters, however, are reported to have looked on the whole thing as a trick of some kind, and concluded that the police would seize the opportunity of searching the houses while collecting the ballots. So large numbers abandoned their homes for the day and declined to exercise the new franchise, while many others made no secret of their indifference to the whole thing. The Council has, however, been elected, and has entered on its duties, some of which seem odd for a deliberative body. The members have agreed, for instance, to undertake in turn to watch the streets through which the Emperor is to pass when he goes abroad, which is very much as if our Board of Aldermen were to form themselves into fatigue parties to see to the cleaning of the streets. A proposal of the commandant to put up barriers on all the roads round St. Petersburg, so that everybody who enters can be narrowly examined, has also been heartily accepted by them and is now in operation. It is most likely that the council will do nothing in the way of initiative. It will confine itself to adopting the commandant's suggestions, but even the shadow of participation in the work of government will probably after a while beget political habits and a sense of political responsibility. The great difficulty which a despot experiences in bestowing free institutions lies in the unreadiness of the people to believe that he really means it, and that their participation in the work of Government will amount to anything in practice. It is said that if the new system is successful it will be extended to other cities, and it may in time prove the germ of a real parliament. The Nihilists, in the meantime, do not seem to be cowed, and boldly announce that if the man and woman awaiting trial for the late assassination are executed the reigning Czar will be sentenced to death. It remains to be seen whether he has nerve enough for the contest.

Lord Beaconsfield is ill, and, owing to his advanced age, probably very seriously ill, and the Tories are casting about for a successor for him. Lord Cairns, the late Lord Chancellor, and by far the ablest man now in their ranks, a North-of-Ireland lawyer, whose attack on the Dis-

turbance Bill was the heaviest blow the Gladstone Ministry has received in debate, has been trying to show in the Lords that the party will lose nothing by the present chief's absence, by a very bitter arraignment of the Government's peace with the Boers. One good point he has certainly made. The Queen's speech announced in the most positive manner that force would be used to compel the Boers to "submit" before anything would be done to redress their grievances. In the teeth of this, however, peace has been made with them substantially on their own terms, not only before their submission, but after their successful resistance to the royal forces in the field. There is only one answer to this, and that is that when the Ministry drew up the Queen's speech they did not know how earnest and determined the Boers were, and what the cost of subjugating them would probably be. It is to be said, too, that negotiations were in progress before Sir George Colley's reverse at Majuba Hill, and were only interrupted through his deplorable rashness, and it is the resumption of these negotiations which has resulted in peace. The fierceness of the Boer resistance is important as making it clear that, even if defeated, they would probably not remain in the Transvaal, but would abandon their farms and once more "trek" northward into the wilderness, leaving a solitude to the victors.

Mr. Gladstone has at last reached his budget, in presenting which he is once more in a congenial field where wars and rumors of wars do not trouble him, and apparently he is not to be troubled by obstruction in getting it through. There are signs of an alliance, in fact, between the Tories and the Parnellites, and obstruction does not form part of the plan of operations of the coalition. He shows a slight increase of revenue—about \$2,000,000. The number of new features in his programme is small and none of them is important. He returns to his old idea of the need of providing for the reduction of the debt, which he proposes to accomplish by means of annuities, to the extent of \$300,000,000 in twenty-five years—in the presence of the American example this does not seem much—and the other changes, including the reduction of a penny per pound in the income-tax, are slight. He promises a surplus next year of about \$1,500,000. There was, as usual, no opposition to his scheme at this stage, and most probably will be none. The Tories have no one capable of attacking his finance.

Last week it seemed as if the Turco-Greek trouble was brought near its end by the acceptance by the ambassadors of the Turkish proposals, which, it is said, they are about to recommend to the Greeks by an identical note. But now comes the news from Athens that neither Coumoundouros nor any other Minister will dare to accept anything short of the Berlin award, and must fight if anything less is offered. In other words, the volunteers will not go back to their homes without trying to get what they came out for. The Turks evidently believe this, for they are continuing their military preparations and despatching every man they can muster to Thessaly and Epirus. The Porte is doubtless encouraged by the internal troubles both of England and Russia, the only two Powers which were likely to give the Greeks material assistance, and believes that if it is allowed to tackle the Greeks alone it can so sicken them of war as to secure peace and quiet for ten years at least, which to a Turk is as good as a century.

It seems most likely, if not certain, that England will not be represented at the approaching Monetary Conference in Paris. The invitation was so worded as to make it difficult for any mono-metallic Power to take part in the proceedings, as it announces that the Conference will meet "to examine and adopt, with the view of submitting for acceptance by the Governments represented at this Conference, a plan or system for the establishment of the use of gold and silver as bi-metallic money," etc. In other words, the Conference is to be committed at the outset to the view that bi-metallism is a desirable and attainable thing. The German Government has also announced that, though it will be represented at the Conference, it does not look to any union with other Powers about the coinage. All this makes it certain that the Conference will not succeed in accomplishing, at best, anything more than the bringing the United States into the Latin Union. It is gratifying to know, however, that Mr. Dana Horton has gone out with the Commission as secretary, as he is thoroughly master of the subject.

THE REPUBLICAN ALLIANCE WITH SOUTHERN REPUDIATORS.

THE President called the Senate together in extra session on the fourth day of March, for the purpose of submitting a large number of nominations for confirmation. At this writing, therefore, it has been sitting for more than a month, but has done almost no business whatever. The reason of this is that the Republicans wish to expel from office a miscellaneous crowd of ushers and clerks, in receipt of small salaries, and put Republicans in their places. It is not pretended that these offices are not at present sufficiently well filled, or that the business of the Senate has not been and cannot be carried on through them. It is not pretended that the removal of the present incumbents is in the smallest degree necessary to the transaction of the particular business for which the President has called the extra session. Besides this, the leading Republicans, in opposing the removal of Republican officers when they lost their majority in the Senate in 1879, committed themselves boldly to the doctrine that changes in the minor offices of the Senate when a new party came into the majority were objectionable and unreasonable. They took this ground when the Democrats had obtained the majority in the ordinary course of election by the State legislatures of enough Senators of their party to make a majority. Among the persons who took it was Senator Conkling, who declared "that the usage and propriety of the Senate" had decided "that those offices ought not to be put up in a political raffle and made rewards for party services, but that those who held them should be allowed to retain them on their merits." "Able and conscientious officers," said he, "proficient in all their duties, were to be removed at the behest of party managers, that the offices might be subject to the voracity and hunger of those who were supposed to be entitled to reward." Other leading Republican Senators supported this view, and it is a view which does credit "to the usage and propriety of the Senate," if Senator Conkling's account of it be correct. The Republicans, however, are apparently not disposed to act on it one minute longer than they can help, or to be very particular as to the means by which they evade it. They have secured a majority by "a bargain" with General Mahone, of Virginia, who has reached the Senate as "a readjuster," or, in other words, as a supporter of the repudiation of a considerable proportion of the State debt on a pretext which will not bear a moment's examination in the forum of morals, and which the Republicans vigorously denounced in the late Presidential campaign. An alliance with such a man would be objectionable and discreditable under any circumstances, for precisely the same reasons which made the Democratic alliance with the Greenbackers in Maine discreditable, and which made it so injurious to General Hancock to telegraph congratulations to Governor Plaisted after his election. The alliance with Mahone, however, is not simply an acceptance of his support in fighting a common enemy without regard to his opinions on certain questions which the Republicans consider of prime importance. It is an alliance based on an ordinary Tammany "dicker," by which Mahone gets the place of sergeant-at-arms for one of his henchmen, and a noted repudiator, a certain Riddleberger. Mahone's vote is, however, not sufficient under the rules of the Senate to give the Republicans their way in spite of Democratic filibustering, and consequently the Senate has now for four weeks presented the world with the spectacle of a deadlock which hardly differs in any respect from that with which the Board of Aldermen every year makes New-Yorkers familiar. The causes are the same, the procedure is the same; the debates by which the time is whiled away reach about the same level. Mahone as a renegade Democrat and repudiator might be tolerable, but Mahone purchased by "a bargain" cannot be a decent addition to any party. We do not say that the Democrats in the Senate are not quite capable of everything the Republicans are now doing, but we do say that in resisting the execution of this bargain, no matter from what motive they are acting, they are rendering the country a valuable service.

An attempt has been made, both on the floor of the Senate and in other quarters, to give some touch of dignity and respectability to this wretched squabble, by the argument that, by encouraging or magnifying Mahone, the Republicans are helping to break up the "Bourbon" Democracy at the South, and bring into existence a new white party with which the negroes can act. This may prove, in the long run, a

good thing for the State of Virginia, but if it is to be a party based on repudiation, it would be a great calamity to have it called or considered a branch of the Republican party. The misfortune of the Republican party at the South hitherto has been that it has been composed in the main of a few very disreputable white men and a large body of very ignorant blacks. To make it really a force at the South by winning recruits among the better class of Southern whites, and especially the large class whose convictions, or prejudices if one pleases to call them so, are dearer to them than their interests, it must make some pretence to morality and respectability. This would be true even if the Southern whites were as bad as their worst enemies have ever described them. There is no civilized community which does not require that anybody who seeks to influence it by public means shall give it credit for the possession of a fair moral standard. It may be capable of electing a thief, for instance, to high office, but it will not elect him if he is openly presented to it as a thief. It will insist on having him nominated as an honest man, or a man trying to be honest under adverse circumstances. A division at the South, such as the Republicans in the Senate are trying to foster, will not consist in the adhesion to the Republican party of honest and intelligent men who are now arrayed in opposition to it by the unwholesome traditions of slavery and the war. It will consist in the formation of a new party made up of the ignorant, unscrupulous, and dishonest, led by ambitious political adventurers, who will reinforce the Northern inflationists, corruptionists, and jobbers, and whose influence on the public credit and political morality would be very likely in a few years to make the most besotted Bourbon of to-day seem by comparison enlightened and patriotic men. There is nothing from which Republicans ought at this juncture to shrink with more dread than encouraging the growth at the South of an organization whose first act consists in an attempt to bring about a breach of the public faith. That such an organization can ever be of much service to any interest the Republican party professes to care for, is something which all experience forbids us to expect. We must not be deluded on this point by Mahone's cant about a "free ballot and a fair count." When we hear men clamoring for a "free ballot and a fair count," we have to consider a little, before joining forces with them, what they propose to do with the "free ballot and fair count." Let them be never so much entitled to both, we should be careful lest, in our manner of supporting their rights, we seem to give countenance to aims which we know to be bad.

We confess, however, that we do not really believe the alliance with Mahone in the Senate to be as serious as it seems. It does not really mean a want of proper concern about the violation of public faith on the part of Republican politicians. It is in the main an expression of that passionate interest in "spoils" which seems to be rapidly destroying, in the minds of public men, all deep and abiding care for the public business. No such unblushing display of it has ever before been presented to the American people as this deadlock in the Senate. The tide of office-jobbing has been rising for many years, and it now appears as if it had submerged even the Senate's regard for its own dignity. Most readers of the newspapers will have remarked the absence in the press, ever since the discussion of "appointments" began, six months ago, of nearly all mention of the question of fitness for the place as a reason why any candidate was or was not likely to be nominated. We venture to assert that hardly a line can be produced from any party newspaper since Nov. 1, 1880, which would lead a foreigner unfamiliar with American politics to suppose that the offices Mr. Garfield has to bestow were not honorary distinctions, like European decorations, intended to gratify the recipients and their friends, but not to impose any duties or obligations. The distribution has constantly been talked of as if it were a mere act of largesse on the part of a sovereign to followers who had befriended him when exiled from his dominions by a usurper. Of "claims," of "recognition," of services in the nominating convention, of services on the stump, of heavy contributions to the party treasury there has been endless babble, but hardly a word about the requirements of the vast and solemn trust called the government of this great nation. That anything is due to the millions of taxpayers who did *not* vote for General Garfield seems to be no more remembered in political circles than if the revenues were the baggage-train of a defeated army. This is all bad enough as it appears in the hoarse wranglings of the Bosses,

the Henchmen, the Workers, and the Organs, but we doubt if the most disgusted pessimist was prepared for the spectacle of a month's suspension of the public business in the United States Senate in order to fight over the patronage of the office of sergeant-at-arms.

THE TORY PROSPECTS IN ENGLAND.

THE illness of Lord Beaconsfield seems to be generally accepted in England as the close of his political leadership. It is not likely that at his age he will, even under the most favorable circumstances, recover sufficiently to make any active participation in politics again possible. His retirement, however, has now but little significance, so completely has his policy during the later years of his career been discredited by events. Nearly everything the Liberals said in denunciation of it on the stump during the late canvass has been proved, and the principal misfortunes of the Gladstone Ministry have resulted from failures to cut loose from it when they came into power. But the loss of their leader, nevertheless, is likely to cause some inconvenience to the Tories, in that it compels them, if only for form's sake, to find some one to fill his place, which promises to be no easy task. Lord Salisbury seemed in 1874 plainly marked out for the succession, but the figure he cut in the Turco-Russian trouble has made him an impossible candidate. His disingenuousness about the negotiations with Russia made a painful impression even on the Jingoës, and the tergiversations of which he was guilty in discussing the designs of Russia were a kind of thing for which no public man but Lord Beaconsfield seems able to obtain forgiveness. He has always been so cheerful and droll when found out, that the country got into the way long ago of treating his untruthfulness as in a certain sense professional, or, at all events, something which he could not help and did not mean any harm by. It was put in the same category with his blunders about history and geography and political economy—as the constitutional weakness of a romance-writer and an amusing and effective debater. Lord Salisbury, however, cannot laugh things off, and is not an entertaining novelist, and was justly held to have degraded himself by the part he played in the Disraeli comedy. It offended the English sense of propriety to see a real peer acting as second fiddle to the extraordinary performance by which Lord Beaconsfield sought to remodel the empire on the plan laid down in his earlier novels. Lord Cairns, the despatches say, has been bidding for the succession by a furious attack on the Gladstone concession to the Boers, and he may for the moment serve their purpose. He is old, but he is very able and invariably knows what he is talking about, which will to the Tories be a novelty in a leader, as they have not seen it since Peel deserted them. The late Lord Derby was nearly as loose in his statements as the author of 'Vivian Grey.'

The objection to Lord Cairns, that he is of humble origin, which some of the correspondents say is likely to have weight with the Tories, is an absurd one. His birth is not so humble as Disraeli's or Lord Eldon's. In fact, the Tories have always been more tolerant of the defects in origin or social standing of their chiefs than the Whigs have ever been. The probabilities are now that they will drift on with such mild rule as they get from Sir Stafford Northcote in the Commons, and such masterly defences of the established order as Lord Cairns can supply in the Lords, until the real tug of war comes in the shape of a Liberal attempt to make the three great changes which are now looming in the horizon: a reform in the land laws; the assimilation of the borough and county franchise, which would give votes to the agricultural laborers; and, though last not least, the disestablishment of the Church. It is over these that the great historic parties of English politics will probably fight their last fight; for it is not likely that the Conservative party as now organized would survive the defeat in which the fight is pretty sure to result. The change in the land laws and the enfranchisement of the agricultural laborers would deprive what is now called the "landed interest" of its remaining influence in politics, and would probably cause the rapid disappearance of the squires from the House of Commons, menace the privileges of the House of Lords, and would, there is some reason to fear, convert the Tory magnates into secluded pessimists of the type of the French Legitimists, mourning in the clubs and country-seats over the ruin of their nation, and discovering every day fresh proofs of Radical wickedness. In this final struggle,

however, it is not likely that Mr. Gladstone will live to take part. Its burden will come on younger men, on whose imagination the England created by the great Whig Revolution has less hold.

The present conflicts over questions of foreign and colonial policy are really mere skirmishes, and are the sequelæ of the Jingo attempts to reproduce the glories of the Elizabethan period. They give little indication of the condition of parties even in the near future. The Irish and Boer disturbances are, however, proving useful, probably in a degree which few persons two years ago would have thought possible, in calling the attention of the English democracy to the danger and discredit which lie in the incapacity of the English mind for entering into the state of feeling of men of different origin, or manners, or order of thought. We have frequently, in discussing the Irish question, spoken of the curious necessity under which the Irish have labored ever since Englishmen began to feel any responsibility for the condition of Ireland at all—that is, since the Union—of resorting to violence and disorder to convince Englishmen that they had any real grievances and to procure redress of them. Simple talk has never produced the slightest effect on English opinion. The Boers, as our London correspondent remarks, have discovered that this necessity was not peculiar to Irishmen. They have agitated and remonstrated against annexation for three years, not only without furthering their object but with a steady increase of English contempt for them and indifference to their claims. As soon as they took arms and began to kill people, and make a great noise, their cause found powerful defenders and underwent thorough discussion, and now, after three small fights, they find not only that nearly everything they claim is conceded to them, but that a deep respect for them has sprung up in the English mind.

The Irish experience has been very similar, except that, owing to their nearness to England, their attempts at resistance have been less fortunate. They have thoroughly learnt the lesson that when they seek any grave changes in legislation they must arm themselves, utter the most horrible threats, and indulge in assassination and arson on a great scale. The American colonies and Canada learnt the same lesson, but turned it to better account. The exceeding inconvenience as well as discredit of having the wishes of dependencies communicated to the Government in this way seems to be now for the first time brought home to the English voters, and it has apparently been flashing some new light on passages of English history of which the mass of the people have until now had little knowledge or comprehension. This, for the first time in English history, holds out some hope of a *modus vivendi* with Ireland. If, as seems likely, the Radicals once accept the doctrine that Ireland does not exist for the benefit of England, but for her own benefit, and that what Irishmen have to say about the conditions of their own existence deserves careful consideration, there can hardly be a doubt that terms of accommodation and even of friendship between the two countries will speedily be reached.

The fact is that in their attitude towards Ireland the Tories are now "fighting for position"—that is, making preparation for the still greater struggle over the English land question. Curiously enough, too, there can hardly be a doubt that the prosperity of France is exerting through the Irish land question a powerful influence on the English land question. There is nothing in the English economical creed which has acted more prejudicially against the claims of the Irish tenantry than the belief that small farms were a wasteful division of the soil, and should be discouraged by legislation. To this was added a firm belief in the innate disposition of the Irish to subdivide infinitesimally, if the landlord let go his control in ever so slight a degree. Moreover, nothing was more firmly rooted in the English economical creed. It has, however, received a blow, which is undoubtedly affecting the imagination of the English constituencies, by what has been occurring in France during the past ten years, and particularly during the last two months. In 1823 McCulloch, the well-known economist, predicted that under the law of descent established by the Revolution, combined with the French passion for land, France would, in fifty years from that date, be the "greatest pauper warren" ever seen, and would supply "hewers of wood and drawers of water to every other country in Europe." The prediction met with general acceptance in England, and the supposed horrors of French subdivision have had great influence ever since in preventing a hearing for any proposition for

giving the Irish peasant more control of the soil. The fifty years have, however, elapsed. The French peasant, in spite of the absence of schools, in spite of numerous wars and revolutions, of a devastating invasion, followed by an enormous ransom, has prospered as no other peasantry in Europe has prospered during the same period. He has not subdivided the land to an injurious extent, has not converted France into a pauper warren, and supplies fewer hewers of wood and drawers of water to foreign nations than any country in Europe. Finally, he has shown, by the success of the late loan, which was taken up by Frenchmen at least ten times over, that his habits, prejudices, and passions are all highly conducive to a wonderful accumulation of national wealth and comfort, and to a very high degree of national credit. Nothing could do more to strip the Irish small farmer doomed to divide up his land into little patches for his enormous family, the result of absurdly early marriage (the statistics show that he marries considerably later than the Englishman or Scotchman), of the odious associations which have hitherto surrounded him in the English economical mind.

ENGLISH VIEWS OF INTERNATIONAL COPYRIGHT.

LONDON, March 18, 1881.

FORTY-TWO years ago Lord Palmerston offered to enter into a copyright convention between this country and the United States. Other attempts have been made in the same direction, but nothing has yet been accomplished. The complete failure of overtures made by Lord Granville in 1872 to the Government at Washington caused a general feeling here that the case was hopeless. It was, then, with as great surprise as satisfaction that British authors recently learned that the United States Minister had placed a draft of a proposed copyright treaty before their Government. Though it was intimated that this had been done in such a way as not to bind the United States Government to take further steps, yet the overture itself was welcomed as indicating at least a disposition to do something. Authors and publishers have met together and discussed the draft of the proposed treaty, and set forth the changes which they consider desirable.

I have been present at many of the meetings which have been held, and I have conversed with many of the persons whose interests are involved. What has struck me the most is the comparative indifference with which the result is regarded. Eight years ago when meetings of the same persons took place for the purpose of urging Lord Granville to deal with the matter the expectation was much stronger that the words spoken would not be wasted. Messrs. Appleton and other publishers of note were understood to be energetically working in the United States to bring about international copyright, and it was not supposed that they would be utterly defeated in their object. The power and determination of the Messrs. Harper to hinder copyright in the United States being granted to British authors were not adequately appreciated in 1872. It is believed that the Messrs. Harper have changed their opinions and their tone now, and that they are as anxious to profit by international copyright as they once were to profit by its absence. Whether they will be as powerful as allies as they were when enemies remains to be proved; meantime, there is a notion that there will be no lack of vigorous and unscrupulous opponents at Washington of any scheme of international copyright.

What contributes to increase the feeling of despondency is the alteration which has occurred in the relation between authors on this side of the Atlantic and publishers on the other. These have become quite different from what they were a few years ago. Till a recent date the want of international copyright was growing of less consequence. Publishers in the United States had made arrangements which almost compensated for copyright to the British authors whose books were deemed worth reprinting, these authors being paid a fair remuneration. Sometimes, indeed, an author received his first payment, not from the publisher of his work in England, but from the publisher who had reprinted it in the United States. Carlyle records that such was his experience in the case of 'Sartor Resartus' and his 'French Revolution,' and Mr. Spedding, another deceased man of letters, made the avowal in a pamphlet on publishing that, till he received a sum of money from a publisher in the United States, he had never realized the fact that authors received anything but the credit of producing useful books. If the "courtesy of the trade" which has enabled your publishers to live together in amity, while accumulating fortunes, and also to share a part of their gains with the authors whose works they reproduced, still prevailed in the United States, there would be little call or need for international copyright. If British authors did not get all they desired, so long as the "courtesy of the trade" had the force of an unwritten law they at least got something worth having, and they showed no disposition to complain. Now that the "courtesy of the trade" has ceased to be generally observed, the case of these authors is such that almost any change would be a benefit to them. One of the most popular of our novelists told me yesterday that he does not receive £10 where formerly he used to receive £100 from the United States reprinter, and

that he expects soon to see his books reprinted without any return being made to him. In these circumstances the British author is not disposed to be too exacting when called upon for his opinion as to the draft treaty now under the consideration of the British Government.

I assume that your readers are acquainted with the terms of that treaty; they have been stated and commented on in your columns. The two main points are, that a work by a British author which is to have the protection of copyright must be registered, printed, and published in the United States, and that these conditions must be fulfilled within three months after its publication in England. In a memorial signed by the leading authors of this country, and sent to Lord Granville in 1872, it was intimated that if international copyright can be had only on condition that British authors arrange with United States publishers for the reproduction of their books, the condition would be accepted. A like feeling prevails now. But strong objections are entertained as to the condition of limiting the time for making arrangements to three months. At an influential meeting which I attended, and of which no adequate report has appeared, an author read an extract from the *Nation* approving of the suggestion of Messrs. Robert Clarke & Co., that the period should not be three months but a year. When the deputation appointed to wait upon the President of the Board of Trade had an interview with him this alteration in the terms was found to have his approval. A suggestion made by the Board of Trade, to the effect that whereas the importation of English books into the United States was forbidden, the importation of editions published in the United States of copyright books should be permitted in England, was opposed by authors and publishers as alike uncalled for and unfair. It is a suggestion supposed to emanate from Mr. Farrar, the permanent secretary to the Board and a declared enemy of copyright in any form. The president intimated that he would abandon the suggestion in deference to the views of authors and publishers.

While authors and publishers have been discussing and disputing over the terms they ought to accept, it would appear as if they had been disquieting themselves in vain. An article in the form of a letter from a correspondent, which appears in the *Times* to-day, seems to prove conclusively that no treaty can be negotiated which will be worth more than the parchment whereon it is engrossed. In that article the whole subject is reviewed and the doings of United States publishers are explained. The writer points out that if some of the latter are favoring a copyright treaty now, it is because they find that they will be the gainers by it; but he declines to criticise the draft of the proposed treaty, on the ground that, if the treaty were negotiated, it would be invalid. His argument is based on the fact that the Constitution specifically empowers Congress "to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing, for limited times, to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries." Now, Congress has exercised this power in both of these cases. In the case of copyright, a section of an act of Congress expressly denies copyright to aliens unless they are residents in the country; which means unless their permanent place of abode is the United States. A treaty which should profess to grant what an act of Congress distinctly denies would be even more worthless than the convention relating to trade-marks, which was concluded under the sanction of an act of Congress.* Unless this argument be upset, it is clear that it is to Congressional legislation and not to negotiation that we must look for international copyright. The writer of the article states that in the analogous case of patent law the alien inventor has received the justice at the hands of Congress for which the alien author now waits. There was a time when an alien inventor was punished in purse for the misfortune of his origin. Whilst a citizen of the United States paid a fee of thirty dollars for a patent, "a subject of the sovereign of Great Britain" paid five hundred dollars, and "any other foreigner" paid three hundred dollars. This distinction was removed in 1870. It is argued that if Congress should give as candid a consideration to the position of the alien author as has been given to that of the alien inventor, the result will be as satisfactory in the former case as it has been in the latter.

Such are the views which prevail here on the subject of international copyright, and such are the hopes which are cherished in some sanguine breasts. I entertain a belief that the people of the United States have hitherto been misled by the representations of publishers who were averse to any legislation which should interfere with the reprinting of English books. When the people learn that the price of the books which they place on library shelves would not be any higher than it was when the "courtesy of the trade" was in general operation, they may be of opinion that Congress should legislate and please both native publishers and British authors. R.

ENGLISH MODERATION TOWARDS THE BOERS.

LONDON, March 27, 1881.

ENGLAND has been passing through a singular moral crisis, of a kind which could hardly arise in any other Old-World country. She is divided between the anger and desire for revenge which is natural in a people

* The Supreme Court has ruled against this view.—ED. NATION.

whose army has been defeated, and a sense of the folly of fighting merely for revenge if no other sufficient ground can be shown for the war. Some five years ago, when the Tory Government was in power, the territory called the Transvaal, as large as France, was annexed to British South Africa by a British Commissioner who had been sent up to examine its condition. It was inhabited by a large mixed population of blacks and by a few Dutch farmers, numbering, perhaps, five or six thousand families, who had migrated northwards from the Cape to get away from the British. They had established here a republic which ruled the natives, and, unless they are much maligned, they had maintained under the name of apprenticeship a species of negro slavery. According to one account they resisted the annexation, according to another they were practically well pleased with it, because at that moment unable without British help to defend themselves from the attacks of the Zulus. What is certain is, that during the last three years they have continued to complain of vexatious treatment at the hands of the colonial authorities, and to demand their independence back again. When the Liberals came into power their hopes rose, but no change followed. It was thought in London that, though the annexation might have been a mistake, to undo it would be a worse mistake. The Government was misled by its agents on the spot into thinking that the agitation was unreal. The Dutch began to perceive (as the Irish have perceived also) that unless they made a tremendous noise and began to kill people they would not be listened to. So in last December they rebelled, or declared war, whichever one is to call it, and being in serious earnest, strong fellows with plenty of courage, and excellent marksmen, they have proved themselves formidable enemies. An attempt of the valiant but rash general who commanded the British to force the strong position they had taken up was repulsed, and a few days after he was killed and his forces defeated in the attack on Majuba Hill, of which you have all heard.

The news produced a double effect in England. There was a sense of shame at the disaster, even though the troops do not seem to have behaved badly, and a natural desire to retrieve it by a speedy victory. The Tory newspapers cried out that now surely even this craven government of Mr. Gladstone would not think of peace until the honor of our arms had been asserted by inflicting condign punishment on the Dutch rebels. Others argued that it would be a serious thing for British prestige all the world over if it should become known in India, for instance, that, after having been defeated, we had yielded to the demands of our enemies. But at the same time there arose a strong sense of respect for men, not trained soldiers but mere farmers, who had fought so well, and a conviction that nothing less than substantial grievances and a deep passion for independence would have induced them to embark in a struggle against our infinitely superior power. Thus people were led to ask more earnestly the question whether there was anything to be gained by keeping the Boers in subjection; whether, if it were not our own case, we should not be sympathizing with men fighting in the name of freedom, and whether, if there was no really valuable end to be attained, we were justified in continuing the war merely to vindicate our dignity and honor. What is the use, it was said, of being a great nation if you cannot also afford to be a magnanimous nation? Can the prestige of England really require to be vindicated by victories over a people who have not eight thousand fighting men all told? The parallel with the conduct of George III. and his ministers at the beginning of the struggle with the American colonies of course suggested itself. Meetings have been held in London and some other large towns in which the cause of the Boers is openly advocated, and advocated not the less heartily because their Government is republican, for we have in England a good deal of quiet republicanism among the working classes. The Ministry is being plied in the House of Commons with questions from both sides, the Tories anxious to convict it of pusillanimity in treating with victorious rebels; the Radicals endeavoring to extort something like a pledge that the war will be stopped forthwith. In the country at large there has been little excitement, because everybody knows that Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bright are for the moment omnipotent, and that they have the strongest possible desire to settle the dispute promptly. The latest advices seem to indicate that there is a fair probability that this will be done. Should the Boers obtain the substance of their demands, the Tory opposition will, of course, make capital against the Government out of what they have already begun to call "peace with dishonor," and no doubt contemptuous reflections will be made upon English want of spirit by German newspapers. We shall be told that in abandoning our conquests in Afghanistan and our annexations in South Africa we are confessing ourselves an enfeebled and declining power. However, the ordinary Englishman has sufficient national pride not to care what foreigners may say about him. Though he likes to think that his country is great, active, and respected, he has also a shrewd sense that while some things are worth fighting for and paying for, other things are not; and he conceives, whether he be Tory or Liberal, that there is neither glory nor gain to be had out of crushing a few Dutch farmers into unwilling submission, and holding a large and poor region ill-suited for British colonization, likely to produce nothing but another crop

of native difficulties. Still more significant is the strong moral feeling which the whole question has evoked. Neither in Germany nor in France, possibly not in any part of the European Continent, would a matter like this be treated so distinctly on a moral basis as it has been treated in England. Nor would the conscience even of England have been so sensitive on the point but for the shock which the language and conduct of the late Government, especially of Lord Beaconsfield and Lord Salisbury, as regards English policy in the East and in Afghanistan, gave to the religious feelings of the Nonconformists and the humanitarian feelings of the working classes.

Another and a more painful lesson of these South-African difficulties which has forcibly impressed itself on men's minds, a lesson that may become significant to you also, should the policy of annexation be ever resumed by the United States, is the extreme difficulty which any state, and especially a free state, where power changes hands from one party to another, finds in governing distant dependencies. The intentions of the British Government at home, both under the Tories and under Mr. Gladstone, towards the Boers and the natives, have been honest and humane. But the colonial authorities, partly from their tyrannical spirit, partly from mere stupidity and clumsiness, have managed to mislead the Home Government, to conceal the truth from it, to exasperate the Boers, and involve us in perfectly unjust and needless wars with the natives. Giving free representative local institutions to a colony does not mend the matter; for it is the constitutional government at the Cape, with its Parliament, that brought about the war with the Basutos which goes smouldering on in spite of constant efforts made from England to have it extinguished. We are beginning to judge the behavior of the Russians in Turkestan and of the French in Algeria—even, perhaps, the darker misdeeds of the Spanish conquerors of America—more leniently when we perceive from our own experience how hard it is to govern justly colonies of mixed population, even with the help of steam and the telegraph.

In domestic affairs there is, for the moment, a lull. Obstruction in the House of Commons is suspended, though no one can tell how soon it may break out afresh. The two bills for restoring order in Ireland, that which suspended habeas corpus and that which prohibits the possession of arms in certain districts, have come into operation without producing any outbreak. The arrests made have been mostly of obscure persons, and have caused no considerable stir. Ireland is so much accustomed to extraordinary remedies that they do not cause the same disgust and indignation as they would in England. What is most to be feared is that a few fiery spirits, driven from Ireland by the activity of the police, under the large powers they now enjoy there, may harass England herself by plots similar to those which marked the Fenian movement fifteen years ago. The assassination of the Emperor of Russia, which has produced an unparalleled impression of terror all over Europe, making sovereigns and statesmen feel that they hold their lives at the mercy of conspirators, so great are the facilities which modern science affords to murderous designs, may stimulate the use of explosives against public buildings as well as against individuals. In the Middle Ages the habit of poisoning sometimes passed into a kind of epidemic; and safe as England appears to be from such acts of violence when compared even with Germany, one cannot say that here and there men may not be found whose imagination will be fired by the ultimate success of the Social Democrats of Russia in their long campaign against the Czar.

Regarding the new Sovereign of Russia and his policy very little is known here, although he has been more than once in England, and has married the sister of the Princess of Wales. As he was the second son, and had come to manhood before his elder brother's death, he was not educated for the throne, but rather for a military career, and is believed to be distinctively a soldier in habits and ideas, a man blunter than his father and with less pleasing manners, but apparently with some force of will and tenacity of purpose. The Germans are, of course, very apprehensive that he may prove no friend to them. It is felt that a new element of danger has been added to the already perilous situation.

Y.

VIENNESE LOCAL COLOR.

VIENNA, March 20, 1881.

RECENT census returns show that the increase of population in Vienna during the last decade has not been so rapid as in most of the leading Continental cities. The population of Vienna, including the suburbs, is now 1,085,455, while in 1869 it was 832,617. The rate of increase during the last five years has been 8.4 per cent., while the figures for Berlin are 16.4, Hamburg 17.7, Munich 15.3, Hanover 28.9, Leipzig 16.8, Stuttgart 9.1, and Dresden only 1.4. The local papers attribute the more rapid growth of Berlin to the advantages that city gained by becoming the centre of the German Empire, Vienna having, on the other hand, lost these advantages by the decentralizing tendencies of the present Government, owing to which some of its importance and attractions have been transferred to Buda-Pesth. In the outer districts and the suburbs the increase in population has been larger than in the city proper, where the ta-

imposed on buildings are outrageously high. According to the comic papers, everything connected with a house is now taxed except the windows and the bricks; and even these are now being counted by the officials. It seems that those who live within the lines have to pay a special duty even on their victuals. Officials are stationed at all the principal streets coming from the railway stations; and it makes a strange impression on a foreigner, who has travelled perhaps all day on Austrian soil, to be stopped once more at the city lines and have his trunk or valise re-examined to see if it does not contain a dead rabbit or a head of cabbage. The "city" proper is, in the case of Vienna, only a small portion—about one-twelfth—of the whole city, and is still the nucleus of the whole, containing as it does the principal hotels, the finest shops and cafés, the theatres and aristocratic residences. It is easily accessible to all, on account not only of its central position but of the peculiar plan on which the whole city is built. A comparative anatomist would class Vienna not among the bilateral cities, divided by a broad central street into two equal halves, but with one of the types known as *radiata*—perhaps among the star-fish—for this reason: The whole of the central city is enclosed by the wide and handsome Ring-Strasse, which has almost the shape indicated by its name. Outside the Ring-Strasse lies the main body of the city, divided into nine districts bearing different names, each district having as a main artery a large street which radiates from the Ring-Strasse to another outer circle, the Gürtel-Ring, inside of which lie the suburbs. Communication between the several parts of the city is well provided for by an extensive network of tramways, public carriages, and omnibuses. The latter, however, are the most torturing and bone-shaking contrivances imaginable, as the greater part of the town is roughly plastered with stones; and the tramways are so slow that a good walker can almost keep up with them. Both the street-cars and omnibuses are divided into compartments for smokers and non-smokers, an arrangement which is here almost a necessity, as in consequence of the high tax on tobacco the quality consumed by the average smoker is so nauseating that it becomes simply intolerable to ladies and to those men who cannot protect their nostrils by lighting a decent cigar of their own.

In its general outward appearance Vienna is gradually becoming one of the most imposing of modern cities. While the central part may for many years yet retain its mediæval characteristics—its narrow streets, crowded houses, and mysterious short passages leading through inner yards and connecting adjoining streets—the Ring-Strasse will be of strikingly handsome appearance as soon as the scaffolding has been removed from the various large buildings now approaching their completion. The new opera-house was finished some years ago; and although its exterior gave rise to adverse criticism in some quarters, its interior, with its ingenious contrivance for regulating the temperature, is a model of elegance and comfort. The hints afforded by the builder of the Opéra are doubtless being utilized in the construction of the new royal Burg-Theater for comedy and tragedy, which has long been felt as a necessity, the old house being so small and clumsy that an opportunity to get a decent seat, unless ordered a week ahead, has been for some time the exception rather than the rule. The new University, for which a capital site has been chosen near the lovely Votive-Church, will be, by all odds, the handsomest structure of the kind on the Continent, and will doubtless exert some influence in attracting students, and thus raising the other departments of the University to the popularity and fame now enjoyed by the medical department alone. The new Rath-Haus or Court-house, the interior of which will be decorated by several famous artists, including Makart, is, as far as I can judge in its present stage of completion, the finest specimen of modern architecture I have seen, although I do not pretend to be an authority in such matters. These buildings, together with some others that might be mentioned, Prof. Lübke doubtless had in his mind among other things when he asserted in a lecture the other day that within the last few years Vienna has attained a rapid growth in art unequalled anywhere since the days of the Renaissance. The effect of these new buildings is enhanced by the fact that most of them not only have the advantage of the wide space offered by the Ring-Strasse but are surrounded on several sides by open grounds and gardens. The Viennese magistrates have been wise in time and saved from the ravages of the architects large tracts of park and breathing grounds, so necessary for the health and pleasure of the inhabitants of the inner city.

Of the private new buildings which are being erected in various parts of the city the majority seem to be cafés, in spite of the fact that Vienna is said to have already some four hundred of them. It is by these cafés, more than by anything else, that the local color of Vienna is determined. In Berlin there seem to be but a few dozen cafés, and, with the exception of those near the centre of the city, they appear to be doing a poor business. In Munich the cafés play a more important rôle, but not by any means as important as here. The Viennese feel a certain pride in having been the first to introduce them in Europe, and feel bound to keep ahead of other cities, both in quantity and quality. It is not only the good coffee and bread that attract everybody to them. They are such comfortable loafing places that few who have a drop of "Bohemian" blood in their veins can resist their charms.

Even the smaller ones present a neat appearance, while some of those lately opened are furnished in a most luxurious fashion. The most handsome article of furniture is usually a pretty young girl, who sits behind the counter and seems to be generally engaged in *dolce far niente* when she is not flirting with some officer or student; although once in a while she pretends to read a newspaper. Her ostensible duty is to put into little trays the lumps of sugar which go with the coffee, and keep account of how many cups each waiter has taken away. But it is evident that this is merely a clever dodge, and that in reality she is there for the purpose of attracting the young men by her beauty and smiles. Etiquette prescribes a bow to this charming creature on entering and leaving a café, while the wholesale greetings of the waiters are usually ignored. There is considerable competition in this matter of "cash-girls" among the different *cafetiers*, and, as pretty girls are not at all rare in Vienna, the result is often admirable. Female waiters, on the other hand, are rarely seen in a Viennese café or restaurant, the reason being that the male waiters are so good that they have acquired a European reputation, and are in demand all over the Continent. They are not so slow as the Italians and not so insolent and conceited as the Germans. In Berlin the swallow-tailed waiter is so overbearing that a comic paper could hardly be accused of exaggeration when it made a tourist admonish one of these august individuals not to be too stuck up, for in these uncertain times a reverse of fortune might easily take place and reduce him to the humble position of a guest, and then he would be sorry for his former conduct. Another fault of the Berlin waiter is that he is apt to be too literary, and to monopolize the papers which people want to read.

As regards newspapers, the variety and quantity of them kept in Viennese cafés is astonishing. All languages are represented, and of the local papers from half-a-dozen to a dozen copies are often kept, so that no one needs to wait on those people who read all the advertisements. Of the local papers the *Neue Freie Presse* is, all things considered, the best daily paper published in the German language. It is anti-governmental, and, like most of its contemporaries, is frequently confiscated for offences often so slight that it requires great insight and profound research to discover them. However, confiscated papers are always to be had by a private understanding with the head waiter, who usually succeeds in concealing a few copies before the police make their appearance. The latter, to stop this proceeding, recently endeavored to enact that a list of the number of all papers kept must be supplied them by each *cafetier*. But their legal right to make such a demand was questioned by the papers, and so, I believe, the matter was dropped. Confiscated papers usually appear in a second edition, omitting the objectionable article; and the fact of a number having been confiscated being announced by the publishers in conspicuous posters at the street-corners serves as a good advertisement in the eyes of liberal readers. Whether the tax of two kreuzers charged on every foreign political newspaper received here by mail is intended also as a measure to prevent the introduction of heretical opinions relating to the Government, or merely one of the innumerable petty devices for replenishing the exchequer of an "effete monarchy," I do not know.

All things considered the Wiener-café must be regarded as an admirable institution. If our temperance societies would endeavor to introduce it into American cities, with its good coffee, abundant newspapers, and smiling maidens, they would have better success in weaning men from bar-rooms than can ever attend their present attempts to suppress personal liberty. Of course these cafés are not all of the same physiognomy, but vary considerably in the character of their habitués. Many of them are open at all hours, day and night, although there are certain hours when they are more crowded than at others. At about half-past nine there is a sudden emptying of all the cafés and restaurants (excepting those near the theatres and the night-cafés), the cause of which is the desire to avoid paying the *Sperrkreuzer*. This is a ridiculous sort of personal tax which has grown out of the apparently mediæval custom of closing the portals of all houses precisely at ten o'clock. Any one who gets home after ten has to pay the portier ten kreuzers when he opens the door, while those arriving after twelve give him twenty. Ten kreuzers are only five cents, but when you add them together for a whole year they make up a neat little sum which few Germans are willing to throw away. Hence the emptying of the cafés, and hence also the unusual haste of pedestrians on the street just before the fatal hour. Indeed, the influence which the portier exercises on the habits of life here is quite extraordinary, for it is doubtless in deference to the wishes of the people to avoid paying the door-tax that the theatres all begin as early as seven, and mostly end at half-past nine. As each house, according to Continental custom, contains some dozens of families, the door-tax seems to be a sort of dodge on the part of the house-owners to make the portier a self-supporting institution. The health of these poor creatures always suffers from the continual interruption of their sleep; but when one has occasionally to wait for them ten or fifteen minutes in a bitter cold night all pity for them vanishes. That the custom is an absurd one for a million-city is generally admitted, and there is now an agitation having for its object the introduction of the custom in vogue in Berlin, where the doors are also closed at ten, but where

everybody has his own night-key. The present fashion must be all the more disagreeable because there is a general desire among the Viennese to postpone supper till after the theatre. After supper many of those extravagant individuals who have made up their mind to pay their *Sperrkreuzer* proceed to one of the night-café and partake of a cup of black coffee. There is usually music in these cafés from ten till three in the morning. "Damen-Capellen," or feminine orchestras, are just now the fashion in Vienna. They consist of six or more performers on violins, 'cello, bass, flute, and usually a piano and an organ besides, which, added to a peculiar feminine intensity of tone, gives these bands a quite distinctive and peculiar character. Like all the Viennese bands, from Strauss's down to the ordinary beer-house band, they play dance-music with that wild enthusiasm of which those who have never visited the *Kaiserstadt* can form no conception. It is the most sensuous and exciting music imaginable, and when Ed. Strauss plays at a masked-ball or a promenade concert, one has but to close his eyes to feel himself at once whirling about the hall with his arm around a fair maiden's waist. The Romans cried for *panem et circenses*; the Viennese for a Strauss waltz. Accordingly, whether one goes to the ballet at the Opéra, to an aristocratic soirée, to a masked-ball or to a private *Kränzchen* in a suburb, the majority of those present will always be found graceful and indefatigable dancers.

Gaiety in every form and at all times, and an unlimited capacity for amusement, seem to constitute the principal difference between the Austrian and his cousin, the full-blooded German. Vienna has the best theatre of all German cities, the Burg-Theater being equalled only by the Comédie-Française; operetta flourishes here as nowhere else; the opera, as a whole, has no superior; concerts are less frequent than in Berlin, but more liberal and cosmopolitan in character; and minor species of amusement exist in great variety. But to the young folks these entertainments serve but as a first course, to be followed, at least during the carnival, by a dessert in the shape of a dance. At all their entertainments the Viennese are exceedingly liberal in the bestowal of applause, and they always seem to succeed in amusing themselves, which is more than can be said of their northern neighbor and of some other nations. The pessimistic temperament and *Weltsehmerz* do not flourish here. The cause of the Austrian cheerfulness may lie partly in climatic influences, partly in the free consumption of good wine and light Pilsner, in place of the dark, heavy German beer. A special word has been coined by the Viennese to express their favorite temperament or character—the word *fesch*, the exact meaning of which it is as difficult to give as that of *gemüthlich*, although jolly, good-natured, bright, and *chic* seem to enter into its composition. To say of a girl that she is "*ein feschcs Mädchen*" is equivalent to saying she is "simply charming"; and such girls are not rare here. Moreover, outside of America there is not a city where female beauty is so common an article as here, the cause being probably the same in both cases—the mixture of nationalities. Thanks to Hungarian and Italian influences, the prevailing type here is brunette. The typical Viennese girl is lively and graceful, and in social demeanor she takes an intermediate position between the quiet and prudish German maiden and the often too Daisy-Millerish American girl. The natural cunning of woman is beautifully illustrated in the matter of feet. German women are not noted for small and neat feet, and accordingly they wear long dresses. Viennese women have the neatest feet imaginable, so, of course, short dresses are the fashion with them. In intellectual training the average Austrian woman is not on a par with the German, although in æsthetic accomplishment she is hardly her inferior. Those who believe in the theory that men and women should stand to each other in the relation of prose and poetry will be likely, therefore, to prefer the Austrian, all the more as the education of German girls is, after all, rather more domestic than intellectual, as with us. The Austrian men, on the other hand, do not make as good a show as the Germans. At least there is no question that, aside from the more elegant and tasteful uniform of the Prussian military classes, one meets more handsome men in Berlin than here. It may be an odd fancy of mine, but my experience goes to show that a similar difference in the average physical beauty of the sexes prevails in some other countries that might be mentioned.

Correspondence.

POLITICAL COALITIONS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The debate in the Senate upon the alliance of the Republicans with Mr. Mahone presents little that is pleasing either to Democrats or Republicans, and it is not a matter of surprise that its defence should be largely confined to such Senators as Mr. Logan and Mr. Hoar. The general obtuseness of the one upon questions of political ethics and the intense partisan bitterness of the other qualify each of these Senators to lead in such a movement, and having committed themselves to the advocacy of this alliance with all it implies, it is to be expected that brazen effrontery should be exhibited, espe-

cially when staggering under the weight of evidence which the Democrats are accumulating in proof of the bargain. Senator Hoar especially has shown himself to be utterly shameless, in citing as a precedent for this bargain the fusion which made Charles Sumner a senator from Massachusetts and Mr. Boutwell the governor of that State. As reported in the *Congressional Record* of March 26, Mr. Hoar said:

"Mr. Boutwell was elected to the office of governor of Massachusetts by the united votes of the Democrats and Freesoil party, and Mr. Sumner was sent to the Senate. Mr. Chase was elected from Ohio in the same way, and John P. Hale from New Hampshire. What American, what lover of liberty, what lover of an honest and fair vote in the length and breadth of this land would wipe out of the political history of this country the election of Salmon P. Chase, of John P. Hale, of Charles Sumner?"

Now, if there is a page in the political history of the United States which every lover of his country should wish to have obliterated, this is that page; a record in which two great parties—one already identified with the progress and glory of the country, the other just struggling into existence, but destined at no distant day to control the Government during a quarter of a century—deliberately threw their political principles to the dogs and corruptly parcelled out between them political power. This leaf from the history of Massachusetts, which Mr. Hoar as a native of that State took occasion to glorify, has been held up to the scorn and reprobation of all men by another native of Massachusetts, in comparison with whom Mr. Hoar intellectually and morally is as darkness to light. Judge Curtis, in the address prepared by him to the people of Massachusetts on this "coalition," said:

"A compact to elect a man for governor in whom the one party does not confide, in consideration of electing a man for senator in whom the other party does not confide, is not a coalition, but a factious conspiracy, and when such compact is made between those who have merely a delegated authority, held in trust to be used under the sanction of an oath to place in office only those in whom the trustees do confide, this is a factious conspiracy to violate a public trust, and as such criminal—not only in morals but in the law of the land."

It matters not to me as a Democrat that the Democratic party must bear its full share in the disgrace of this transaction. I would not revive its memory needlessly; but when it is revived by others for the purpose of glorifying the actors and beneficiaries I would remind those who read Mr. Hoar's eulogy how the transaction was regarded by one of the purest and wisest citizens of Massachusetts, who was a member of the legislature that did the deed, and who in speaking for himself spoke also for the great party with which he acted. It was defended then, as now, upon the ground of precedent, and while it may not be agreeable to Mr. Hoar it may be profitable to others to remember how Judge Curtis met this defence. He said:

"Another ground upon which this bargain is defended is that such arrangements are common and to be expected in legislative assemblies. If this be so, it is time you (the people) knew it. But the assertion is a libel on the honesty of the State, and no man will make it who does not take his own conscious wickedness as the standard by which to measure other men's honor."

Mr. Hoar does not seem to agree with Judge Curtis "that public morals are essential to public order; that absolute fidelity to public trust is the only secure basis of republican government; that it is not lawful to do evil that good may come; that there is not one rule of right in the capitol and another by the fireside; that the crooked paths of intriguers and schemers are not safe ways for honest men to travel." Cannot Massachusetts, when she is next called to make her contribution to the Senate of the United States, find some Republican faithful to the principles of his party, and zealous in maintaining them, but who does know all these things which Mr. Hoar seems not to know, and who will not put his State to open shame by boasting of her dishonor in the past?—Yours respectfully,

J. A. PEARCE.

CHESTERTOWN, MD., March 31, 1881.

THE MAHONE LIBERAL MOVEMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It seems as if the Republican leaders were making another mistake in their effort to build up their party in the South. One of their first acts after the war was to compel a repudiation of all State war-debts. Their next was an appeal to the ignorance and non-property-holders of the South for support. They thus made it impossible for intelligent and patriotic men there to join them. After it had been demonstrated that their effort was an utter failure, there was gradually growing up a feeling that it might become necessary for property and intelligence to unite with them for the protection of public credit. Many men all over the South, impressed with the necessity of preserving the public faith inviolate and the justice of the payment of debts, have been turning more and more towards the party which arrogated to itself that special duty. The prevalence of the repudiation heresy threatened to blight every interest of the South for years, and they tended to look towards the Republican party for protection and assistance.

This was especially so in Virginia. A few Republicans here have been

conspicuous for their fidelity to sound principles in this particular. But the recent alliance between the Republican Administration and Senate and Senator Mahone has driven every one of property and intelligence from thoughts of future sympathy with their party. It is an open coalition with and appeal to the most corrupt elements of Southern society to array themselves against intelligence, virtue, and property on the side of the Republican party. That organization is woefully deceived if it believes that the Mahone movement is the forerunner of any liberal thought or policy in the South. The staple argument of repudiation in Virginia has been, and is, that the debt was created on the credit of slave and other property; that the Northern people destroyed that property; that they hold the bonds, and are therefore not entitled to be paid. This argument, presented on every hustings in Virginia, has had more influence in promoting repudiation than all others combined.

Again, the pretence is set up that the new movement is intended to protect the negroes from the unjust disfranchisement and ignominious punishments imposed by the "Bourbons." The special grievances are that a constitutional amendment adopted in 1875-77 disfranchised all persons convicted of petit larceny, and required prepayment of a poll-tax as a qualification for voting; and also that an act of Assembly passed in 1877-78 imposed the penalty of stripes for petit larceny. It is charged that this disfranchisement and punishment does operate, and was intended to operate, mainly on the negroes. They were voted for by the leading Readjusters in the Legislature when they were adopted. B. W. Lacey, Readjuster Speaker of the House of Delegates 1879-80, and now Readjuster Circuit Judge; and John E. Massey, Readjuster Auditor of Public Accounts, now their prominent candidate for Governor, voted for them in 1874. (*House Journal* 1874-75, p. 218.) Riddleberger, the Republican caucus candidate for Sergeant-at-Arms of the United States Senate, who was a member of the House, did not vote, but he did not oppose them. Massey again voted for them in 1875. (*House Journal* 1875-76, p. 296.) The law imposing the punishment of stripes for petit larceny was voted for by Massey, and by Fulkerson and Paul, Readjuster members of Congress (*Senate Journal* 1877-78, p. 405), and Paul was a member of the Committee which reported the bill.

These are the sort of Liberals and this the kind of Liberal movement the Republican party have adopted and are promoting in Virginia.

A DEBT-PAYER.

MEANS AND ENDS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the *Nation* of the 24th inst. are these words: "The joy with which Senator Mahone has been received into the Republican ranks in the Senate seems, considering that he is a repudiator, or 'Readjuster,' as it is euphemistically called, of the State debt, a little scandalous in view of the horror caused in the best Republican minds by the alliance of the Democrats with the Greenbackers." And then in regard to the "very ingenious excuse for Mahone," that the "Readjuster" movement is a revolt against Bourbonism, you say: "It is quite right to make this explanation, because nobody would ever have guessed what he was about."

And yet, in the *Nation* of October 28, 1880, after stating the charges and countercharges of the two Democratic factions in Virginia, you say: "This is what renders it doubtful, at least to people who have no intimate interest in the honor of Virginia, whether Mahone is not performing a public service in exploding the nonsense and antiquity of Bourbon notions, even at the expense of cheating the creditors of the State." And again, on the 2d of December, 1880, in your comment on the election of Governor Brown, of Georgia, to the Senate, you say:

"If there exists in Georgia a Bourbonism indissolubly wedded to the *status quo* and unreconciled and unreconcilable to the Constitutional Amendments, and on this account chiefly opposed to Mr. Brown, we cannot for our part doubt that, though the hand which guides it may be selfish, the driving deep of the share is for the immediate and ultimate good of the State. We have felt the same thing in regard to General Mahone in Virginia."

It seems, then, that somebody has "guessed" what General Mahone was about before he took his seat in the Senate.—Respectfully,

S. WATSON.

NASHVILLE, TENN., March 27, 1881.

[We have had but one opinion about Democratic dissensions at the South, namely, as cited above, that they were for the ultimate good of that section, and of the country, irrespective of the immediate cause of them. By Bourbonism there we understand not only blindness to accomplished facts and stupid resistance to the inevitable, but a censorship of thought and utterance such as prevailed in the days of slavery. It is, by direct descent, the enemy of free speech, and skilled in the employment of political and social ostracism—and, if need be, of violence—to suppress it. In this sense we have never had any doubt what

General Mahone was about. We do not, however, allow him or Senator Brown to vindicate his character or opinions by reference to the incidental effect of conduct in itself unscrupulous and selfish, nor do we interpret the Republican joy over Mahone's accession in accordance with Mr. Hoar's or Mr. Dawes's sonorous phrases about the sanctity of the ballot-box. We can, with our philosophy of Southern renovation, regard the activity and even successes of the Browns and Mahones with composure, but we shall form our own judgment of their motives. Our attitude towards them, and the like of them, is expressed in the saying—"The Lord often makes use of instrumentalities that I wouldn't touch with a forty-foot pole."—ED. NATION.]

A NEW GROUND OF COMPLAINT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I send you the subscription for the *Nation* for the current year, and at the same time request you *not* to send it to me after this year expires *unless* I before that time order it continued. I don't wish to read a paper which has not *opinions* and the courage due to them. I am often in doubt upon which side of a question discussed in its columns the *Nation* really is. If this is due to my obtuseness, I must read what I can understand; if due to a desire not to avow opinions lest offence be given, then I don't want my time wasted reading timidity. There is one all-important question now on trial by this Union, and upon its correct decision depends more than on any other one question the future welfare and progress of the people of this nation. It affects also materially and directly the whole human race, inasmuch as it involves the capacity of the most advanced of the race to maintain a system of *self-government* springing from and administered by the people. It is the question whether our system of government, by which the national Government or national Union is organized, consecrated, and pledged to the maintenance of self-government in and by the people of the several States, under and obediently to a common Constitution, is to be *maintained*; or whether it is to be revolutionized into a *centralized* government, which leaves to the people of the States only those powers and rights which the central government does not choose to assume.

I don't think any paper which attempts to be on both sides of this question is or can be of any use in the work this *generation* has to do.

Respectfully yours,

O. B. POTTER.

26 LAFAYETTE PLACE, NEW YORK, March 30, 1881.

[This is all very fine; but by what species of "self-government" was Mr. Potter nominated for Congress as a Kelly candidate in this city in 1878?—ED. NATION.]

ARMY DRUNKENNESS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I have just seen the very grave charge, in the shape of a question for information, brought by your correspondent "F. E. R." in your issue of 3d instant against the good name of some army officer holding command. As one much interested in the reputation of the service, I beg to represent that if such a rumor is without foundation it should not be circulated, by implication or otherwise; while if there is any reasonable ground for believing it, it is the duty of a good citizen to present the report, with the data on which it rests, to the Secretary of War, who will undoubtedly cause the truth to appear and justice to be awarded.

March 12, 1881.

[This letter refers to a belief that Victorio's prolonged raid, ended only by his death, in New Mexico, "was caused by a drunken army officer ordering his men to fire on that chief and his warriors at Ojo Caliente."—ED. NATION.]

POLITICAL HERO-WORSHIP.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: A communication which appeared in your issue of March 31, entitled "Political Hero-worship," has seemed to me so manifestly unjust toward our new President, so wantonly oblivious of well-known facts in his character and career, that I am tempted to ask for a brief space in your columns to put the facts, if I can, in their true light.

The premises upon which your correspondent founds his argument I think no one will deny. That the man whom the people "delight to honor," the "ideal President," should be a "representative American," an "imper-

sonation of all that is best in our American civilization"; that our early Presidents were "statesmen, scholars, and gentlemen"; that "early disadvantages, illiteracy, and coarseness" are not in themselves "admirable, virtuous, or heroic," are almost self-evident truths. But by what perversion of logic can these premises be made to warrant the conclusion that the election of James A. Garfield to the Presidency means "a decay in the popular ideal of greatness," or that he is unworthy to be held up as a model for the emulation of our American youth?

To those who know the man, or have watched with any degree of attention the successive steps of his development, President Garfield seems, in a most emphatic sense, to represent what is "best in our American civilization." That he is "a statesman and a scholar," I suppose not even "Spectator" himself would deny. Whether he may also be called a "gentleman" must depend, of course, upon the significance attached to the term; but in the opinion of those as well qualified, perhaps, by education and social advantages as your correspondent to give an intelligent judgment in the case, President Garfield is a "gentleman" according to every standard but one utterly conventional and un-American. He was "born to the purple" in a truer sense than was any Roman Emperor. Finally, though there is nothing intrinsically grand or heroic in "early disadvantages, illiteracy, or coarseness" (the latter of which, in General Garfield's case, never existed), is there not something grand, something admirable, something heroic in the man who has conquered all these disabilities, has attained, in spite of them, an exceptional degree of culture, and has fitted himself to participate with honor in the councils of his State and nation? And is there not something lamentably lacking in the nature which, in such a career as his, refuses to recognize these qualities?

It may be true, as your correspondent quotes, that "democracies lack the picturesque element," yet it seems to me that nothing could well be more "picturesque" than the circumstances of General Garfield's career. How he will acquit himself in his present high office is yet to be seen, but surely he should be granted a "fair field," if "no favor," without prejudice, either in one direction or the other, from anything in the facts of his previous history.

A FAITHFUL READER OF THE NATION.

RAILROAD STOCK-WATERING AND EXTORTION.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Referring to the editorial in the *Nation* of March 24, entitled "The Fallacies of the Anti-Monopoly League," I desire to ask your consideration of certain points. The position taken in the editorial is that railroads must be judged by the same rules which apply to private business, and admitting that your logic is good from that standpoint, I ask you to look at the other side of the question and see if there is not some reason in the view which has been taken of it by many persons, including the highest judicial authority in the United States.

Starting from the point that the State was the original owner of all highways, and that the legislation which authorized, first improved turnpike roads and then the railroad, proceeded on the assumption that the charges on these improved highways must be reasonable and alike to all, the controlling motive in originating the construction of these modern highways has, as a rule, been the improvement of property by obtaining a better outlet to the great markets, and the general improvement of business resulting therefrom. Government aid—national, State, county, and municipal—has been largely extended, and the cases are very few where capital was originally put on these enterprises as a primary investment. It was only after railroads had demonstrated their capacity to be used as a machinery to tax the public that such men as Messrs. Vanderbilt, Gould, and others appeared upon the scene, and inaugurated the state of things of which the public now complain.

In judging this question we must, therefore, take the legal view of it—that railroads perform a public function—that of furnishing highways; that their charges must be uniform and based upon the cost of the service, with a fair profit added thereto. In defining what is a fair profit the Legislatures in several of the States have fixed upon ten per cent. above the cost of operation. I do not wish to discuss the question of whether this is or is not a reasonable compensation; I only mention it as having been, at a time when the rate of interest was much higher than at present, so considered by legislators. If it is not sufficient compensation, I, for one, am quite willing to concede any figure in reason in excess of ten per cent., but I contend that the rights of the railroads and of the public should be defined, so that all cause for controversy may be removed.

That there is a lack of statistics upon which to base conclusions regarding railroad business is surely not the fault of the public; the railroads have fought every attempt made to provide them, and at this very time the New York Central road is opposing with all its power the establishment of a Board of Railroad Commissioners in this State similar to that of Massachusetts. The practice of watering stock seems to me wholly indefensible. You state that there are actually no railroads which have always been profitable.

Take the New York Central, for instance: I happen to know that the original stockholders in the Syracuse and Utica, one of the links consolidated into the New York Central road in 1853, had received two dollars for one that they ever actually put in up to the time of said consolidation, and that it was watered fifty per cent. at the time of that consolidation, and that at the same time the other links constituting the New York Central road were put in at from seventeen to fifty-five per cent. premium. The Mohawk Valley road existed only on paper, and yet it was put into this consolidation at fifty-five per cent. premium, and since that time the whole has been twice watered—once eighty per cent. and again twenty-seven per cent. This was not done upon any pretence that the property had not been remunerative in times past, but was done simply as a means of evading the plainly expressed intention of the statutes creating these roads. This was worse than the practice of capitalizing surplus earnings, and this is condemned in the strongest terms in the reports of the Massachusetts Railway Commissioners, when Mr. Charles Francis Adams, jr., was chairman of that board. The injustice of this practice is set forth in plain terms by the Legislative Committee which investigated the coal combination in this State three years since. Their report says (p. 8):

"During the receipt of these enormous profits many of the coal corporations, as was the case with the railroads not engaged in the coal-carrying trade, unable under their charters or for other reasons to declare dividends upon their stock that would absorb their unexpended surplus, issued additional stock to the stockholders, for which they paid nothing, inaugurated what is commonly known as stock-watering, or a capitalization of surplus earnings, which is in substance exacting money from the people, creating an indebtedness representing the same, and making this the basis for for ever asking the public to pay interest on their own money so exacted."

It has been the practice of railroad companies in the past to put stealings, even, in the capital account; this has been done to the extent of several millions of dollars in the Erie road; and on the New Haven road I am informed that rates have been charged which have yielded, not only ten per cent. upon the original cost, but also upon considerable amounts of water, besides the Schuyler defalcation, which nearly doubled the liabilities of that road. One would think that the stockholders ought to have been liable for a breach of trust in their own service, and that they should have put their hands in their pockets and made up the defalcation, instead of putting it upon the public by issuing additional stock and keeping their rates high enough to pay ten per cent. dividends upon the whole mass.

It would be just as equitable should a merchant meet a loss by the failure of a customer, to charge the amount pro rata to all his paying customers; but the case of the railroad is much worse than this, for the reason that when the amount lost by the failure was once paid by the merchants, that would end it, but in the case of the railroad the obligation in the shape of stock remains a tax upon the patrons of the road for ever.

The frauds of the *Crédit-Mobilier* and the Finance and Construction Company of the Union and Central Pacific roads will remain a tax upon the production and commerce of the country for all time to come. The rates charged for transportation on these roads are simply enormous, and after paying dividends upon the present grossly fictitious cost of these roads, the surplus is invested in improvements which in due course will be further capitalized and form an excuse for taxing the public unduly for transportation services. Why should these men, simply because they have the power, be permitted to go on indefinitely doing such things? The principle of our patent law is that the inventor shall be fairly rewarded, but that after that the benefit of his invention must inure to the public. Why should a few men be permitted to monopolize the invention of steam transportation on land because the law of competition does not work here as it does on the ocean?

So much for the general principles involved in the relations of railroads to the public. Now let us glance at the discriminations practised both as between individuals and communities. These have been absolutely denied by the leading railroad men of the country; Messrs. Vanderbilt and Jewett denied that they existed, over their own signatures to the Hepburn Committee, and yet this committee pronounced the abuses "fully proven." President Stanford of the Central Pacific, in his answer to the questions propounded by a committee of the Chamber of Commerce, of which I am a member, stated that no such discriminations existed in the management of roads with which he was connected, and yet Representative Daggett showed recently on the floor of the House of Representatives at Washington that the people of Nevada were obliged to pay the through rate from New York to San Francisco and the local rate from San Francisco back again to Nevada, and it made no difference whether the work was done or not. For instance, the through rate from New York to San Francisco on a car-load of candles is three hundred dollars. The local rate from San Francisco back to Palisade, 587 miles, is four hundred and eighty dollars. If a merchant at Palisade orders candles from New York, they will stop the car and deliver him the goods at Palisade without taking them through to San Francisco and back again to Palisade, but the charge (notwithstanding the work is not done) is seven hundred and eighty dollars.

As an instance of the discrimination between individuals, the resolutions submitted by Mr. Daggett stated that the freight on eggs from Ogden to Toano cost one man three dollars and thirty-five cents per box, and the same number of eggs in the same sized box, of the same weight, carried the same distance, cost another man sixty-five cents, the only reason being that one shipper has a special contract while the other has none. I could duplicate these instances indefinitely; they exist in a greater or less degree all over the United States. They are rapidly redistributing the wealth of the nation, concentrating it in a few hands and building up a moneyed aristocracy such as the world has never seen.

The Standard Oil Company is a case in point. Mr. Lloyd's article in the March *Atlantic* shows that every gallon of coal-oil pays a tax to the Standard Oil Company of eight and three-quarter cents per gallon—nearly eighty per cent. There were two hundred and twenty millions of gallons consumed in this country last year, and he estimates that the Standard pays dividends of one million dollars per month. Referring to the practice of favoritism in rates for transportation, a report submitted to the New York Chamber of Commerce by Charles S. Smith, Jackson S. Schultz, Benj. B. Sherman, Benj. G. Arnold, Jacob Wendell, Charles C. Dodge, and myself, stated:

"What has happened in the case of the Standard Oil Company may happen in other lines of business. . . . With the favor of the managers of the trunk lines, what is to prevent commerce in the rest of the great staples being monopolized in the same manner? Already it is taking this course; one or two firms in Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and Boston, with their branch houses in the West, are by the favor of the railroads fast monopolizing the export trade in wheat, corn, cattle, and provisions, driving their competitors to the wall with absolute certainty, breaking down and crushing out the energy and enterprise of the many for the benefit of the favored few."

I might go on indefinitely, but space forbids. I did not think when I began dictating this letter to trouble you with so long a communication, but the importance of the subject and the great interest I feel in it must be my excuse. I do not ask you to print this letter—it is too long; but I do ask you to look into this question, to examine the official report of the Hepburn Committee, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States, and I will then trust your own sense of right and wrong, and of what should be public policy, to do justice to this question. Railroad managers may not be altogether to blame for this state of things; I know some of them who are honorable, high-toned, fair-minded men. I think Mr. Fink is one of these, but Mr. Fink does not know all that is going on in the railroad companies under his control. I know of one case where a director in one of the roads in the pool is a silent partner of a shipper who gets a private rebate which gives him an advantage over all other men in that line of business, and until it is made an offence against the law to do such things they will undoubtedly go on, and perhaps even afterward. But with such things prohibited, and with an executive power to see the laws executed, we may reasonably hope that such offences against society will be fewer than they are now. Again apologizing for troubling you at such length, I remain,

Very respectfully yours, F. B. THURBER.

NEW YORK, March 26, 1881.

[We print the above at some inconvenience. Its length prevents our making any comments on it now, but we shall next week say what "our sense of right and wrong, and of what should be public policy," suggests as "justice to this question."—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

HENRY HOLT & CO. have in press Fedor Dostoyeffsky's Siberian narrative, entitled 'Buried Alive'; 'Germany, Past and Present,' by S. Baring-Gould; 'The Young Folks' Astronomy' and 'The Young Folks' History of the War for the Union,' by John D. Champlin, jr.; Sir G. W. Cox's 'Science of Mythology and Folk-lore'; and 'Butterflies: Their Structure, Changes, and Life Histories,' by Samuel H. Scudder.—Other spring announcements are as follows: D. Appleton & Co.:—Jefferson Davis's 'Rise and Fall of the Confederate Government'; the second and third volumes of General Badeau's 'Military History of Ulysses S. Grant'; 'Selections from Arguments, Addresses, and Miscellaneous Papers of David Dudley Field'; Prof. W. Robertson Smith's 'The Old Testament in the Jewish Church'; and the Greek novel, 'Loukis Laras.' Harper & Bros.:—The concluding volume of M'Clintock & Strong's 'Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature'; and a 'Short History of English Colonies in America,' by Henry Cabot Lodge. G. P. Putnam's Sons (who, by the way, will remove this month to more commodious quarters at Nos. 27 and 29 West Twenty-third Street):—'Spain and the Spaniards,' by Edmondo de Amicis; a 'Memoir of Count Gasparin,' from the French, by Major-General O. O. Howard; and Rochefort's 'Mlle. de Bismarck.' Charles Scribner's Sons:—'Turkish Life in War Time,' by Henry O. Dwight; a fifth volume of Max Mü-

ler's 'Chips'; Rawlinson's 'Origin of the Nations'; Mivart's 'The Cat'; and the correspondence between Talleyrand and Louis XVIII. during the Congress of Vienna, lately found in the French archives. Dodd, Mead & Co.:—'A Short History of Art,' based on Lübke, by Miss De Forrest. Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.:—'English and Irish Land Questions,' a collection of essays by Mr. Shaw-Lefevre, M.P. George H. Ellis, Boston:—A new edition of 'Man's Origin and Destiny,' by J. P. Lesley, State Geologist of Pennsylvania. Lee & Shepard:—'Nez-Percé Joseph,' by General O. O. Howard; 'A Handbook of Punctuation,' by Marshall T. Bigelow, of the University Press; and 'New England Bird-Life,' by Winfrid A. Stearns, edited by Dr. Elliott Coues. Lockwood, Brooks & Co.:—Haskell & Laing's 'Dictionary of the Anonymous and Pseudonymous Literature of Great Britain.' J. R. Osgood & Co.:—Mrs. Burnett's 'A Fair Barbarian,' and a 'Life of President Garfield' (which seems either very late or very premature), by Captain F. Mason. Roberts Bros.:—'Massachusetts in the Woman's Suffrage Movement,' by Mrs. Harriet H. Robinson. Jansen, McClurg & Co., Chicago:—'Shadows of Shasta' and 'The Danites of the Sierras,' prose works by Joaquin Miller; and the 'Student's Dream,' a philosophical production "in a somewhat novel form."—The March number of the *Harvard Register* bears the unwelcome tidings that this enterprising periodical is to be definitively suspended after one more issue, partly for want of sufficient support, and partly to make way for a projected *Bulletin of the University*, which is to be an official organ of original information, and something more. This new publication will take the place also of the *Literary Bulletin*, beginning with this month's issue. The *Register*, meantime, maintains itself well on the literary and pictorial side, and promises a final April number of great attractiveness. On p. 176 we find the details of the organization of a University Club, embracing the Corporation, the Board of Overseers, the Academic Council, and the leading representatives of the Library and the Peabody Museum. It will hold quarterly meetings. —The April number of the *Magazine of American History* opens with a good article on the "First Settlement in Ohio," by Maria Cone. It is based on a MS. autobiography of Gen. Rufus Putnam, whose map of Ohio is given in fac-simile. Mr. J. C. Stockbridge enumerates some of the more interesting of the Revolutionary pamphlets in the large collection of the John Carter Brown library, in Providence. —"William Diodate and his Italian Ancestry" forms the subject of the most noteworthy paper in the April issue of the *New-England Historical and Genealogical Register*. It is from the pen of Prof. Edward E. Salisbury, of New Haven. —A new collection of Old-English Legends, with an introduction and notes by C. Horstmann, appears from the press of Henninger Brothers (Heilbronn, 1881). It contains about sixty legends, thirty-six North-English and Scottish, making 536 pages large 8vo, fine print, mostly in double columns. Besides this, the introduction, giving a historical exposition of the church service in connection with the reading of the *acta sanctorum*, or legends, and giving also the bibliography, is a volume by itself. The texts are very carefully prepared with various readings and other apparatus for study, and are of great interest to students of language and explorers of our early literature. —From B. Westermann & Co. we have received Theodor Ackermann's remarkable 'Catalogue of Faust Literature, 1494-1880' (Munich). Of the stock herein described and offered for sale the gem is a unique copy of the 'Historia von Doct. Johan Fausti, des ausbündigen Zaubers und Schwartzkünstlers Teufflicher Verschreibung, Unchristlichem Leben und Wandel,' etc. (1596), with which is bound up an "unknown edition" of the Wagner book of 1594, in which "beschrieben ist Christophori Wagners, des Fausti gewesenens Discipels auffgerichter Pact, so er mit dem Teuffel gemacht," etc. —Another volume of criticism has been put forth by Zola and yet another is promised. For a collection of the dramatic criticisms which he has written during the past five years in the *Bien Public* and the *Voltaire* he has borrowed the title of an earlier essay already reviewed at length in these columns. 'Le Naturalisme au Théâtre: Les Théories et les Exemples' (Paris: Charpentier; New York: F. W. Christern) contains those of his critical articles of which the victims were minor authors. The essays in which he demolishes the chief French dramatists of the nineteenth century are to appear shortly in a second volume, 'Nos auteurs dramatiques.' They will be lively reading in spite of their ponderous style. —A new monthly *Revue Internationale de l'Enseignement* was begun in Paris on Jan. 15, under the auspices of the Société de l'Enseignement, and the editorship of M. Edmond Dreyfus-Brisac (Paris: G. Masson). MM. Masson, Pasteur, Bréal, Fustel de Coulanges, P. Janet, Laboulaye, Monod, and Taine are among the editorial committee. The first number has articles on "Reforms in the Secondary Instruction in France" (the Editor); "Instruction in Diplomatic History" (Albert Sorel); "Girls' High-Schools in Germany" (Dr. W. Noeldeke); and "Harvard University" (Prof. Jacquinot). There is a department of retrospective review of works on education, beginning with D'Alembert's article *College* in the 'Encyclopædia'; international correspondence; official documents and information and general news (as, the anti-Jewish agitation in the German schools). The *Revue* promises to be a substantial addition to educational agencies.

—We are informed that the late Thomas Carlyle left by his will all the works collected in the preparation of his 'Cromwell's Letters and Speeches' and the 'Life of Frederic the Great' to the library of Harvard College, in token of his good-will towards this country; a change of mind which, from a foot-note of Mr. Froude's in the 'Reminiscences,' it might be inferred had been brought about by his reading the 'Harvard Memorial Biographies.'

—A project has been formed of presenting to the University of Aberdeen a portrait of Prof. Alexander Bain, as a memorial of his twenty years' services in that institution, just concluded, and also to found a Bain medal to be given annually to the best scholar in philosophy and logic at Aberdeen. It is thought that from £600 to £700 will be required for this joint purpose. Mr. Daniel G. Thompson, 29 William Street, New York City, will gladly receive any American subscriptions to the memorial.

—A contribution to military hygiene has recently been made by Brigadier-General Ord, commanding the Department of Texas. Certain officers having complained of the insufficiency of the army ration for troops in active service, a circular letter from department headquarters was addressed to post-commanders and surgeons requesting their views as to the necessity of an increase in the food supply. The answers to this letter form the basis for an interesting report upon the whole subject by Dr. Jos. R. Smith, Medical Director of the Department. The officers consulted express the opinion with great unanimity that some increase in the ration is desirable for troops in active service, one post-commander going so far as to assert "that all soldiers in the field or on fatigue-duty are constantly hungry." To throw light upon the causes of this deficiency of food, so generally recognized, Dr. Smith publishes tables showing the amounts accruing during a period of seventeen months to the various company funds from the sale of articles of food comprised in the ration, and also the amounts expended by the companies for articles of food, and for articles other than food. From these tables it appears that the whole amount received into the funds was \$39,141 56; the amount expended, \$36,101 36; and the amount "remaining in the hands of the company commanders available for food, if, in the judgment of these commanders, it was necessary or desirable so to use it," was \$5,983. The same tables also show that \$3,124 64 was spent for articles other than food, and that all the companies, save four, report expenditures of this sort, the largest amount thus expended by any one company being \$337 56. From another table it appears that the so-called "bake-house savings" at the various posts, which really represent the difference in value between the bread issued to the soldier and the flour allowed him by law, amounted to \$12,965 52.

—A consideration of these facts leads Dr. Smith to the conclusion that it is not so much the insufficiency as the injudicious management of the army ration which causes the difficulties complained of. He calculates that "if the soldiers had received three whole rations, or the money value thereof, in the shape of food, all the troops in the field in this department, for seventeen months, could have received the extra issue of flour and beef or bacon recommended and considered sufficient, and have still available for the purchase of food \$8,123 20"; and he accordingly makes recommendations intended to secure this result. The defects of the present system of supplying food to the Army have frequently been pointed out, the deficiency of the bread supply being the most common cause of complaint. Before the war of the Rebellion 18 oz. of "bread or flour" were issued to the soldier. During the war the ration was raised to 22 oz., and since the war restored to its former amount. Army medical officers appear to be generally of the opinion that this smaller amount, when still further diminished by the deduction of the "bake-house savings," is insufficient for troops in active service. Thus, we find in Circular No. 8 of the War Department, published May 1, 1875, that Dr. J. S. Billings, in his report on the Hygiene of the United States Army, endorses the recommendation of Surgeon Glover Perin, Medical Director Department of the Missouri, that the bread ration be raised to 22 oz. of flour or soft bread, except for troops on fatigue duty, who should receive 24 oz. This opinion derives support from the fact that an increase of the bread ration was found to be necessary during the war, and that the War Department has, by General Orders No. 42, March 25, 1875, allowed department commanders to issue 22 instead of 18 oz. of bread at posts where fresh vegetables cannot be raised. It would seem as if the difficulties complained of could be met by an extension of this discretionary power so as to allow department commanders to increase the bread ration whenever in their opinion the necessities of the troops require it.

—Mr. William Beach Lawrence, who died in this city on March 26 after a lingering illness, was a man of unusual attainments. As a public character he belonged, both from his advanced age and his temperament, in the last generation. He was born here in 1800, graduated in Columbia College at an early age, and after three years at law went abroad for further study, carrying with him letters which introduced him to the acquaintance of foreign scholars and statesmen. In 1823 he returned and began the practice of his profession. Three years later he went to London as Secretary of Legation, where, upon

the resignation of Albert Gallatin, he discharged the duties of American Minister in several delicate and difficult matters in such a manner as to win the warm commendation of Monroe and Clay, then Secretary of State. At this time he formed the acquaintance of Bentham, Grote, Sir John Bowring, and others, and interested himself in the economic and political struggle then in progress in Great Britain. Relieved of his official duties by Jackson, he betook himself to Paris and literary studies, and at the house of Marbois, whose work on Louisiana he translated, met Guizot, Villemain, and Cousin, and was a constant attendant at the lectures of the Sorbonne. In 1829 he again returned to America, lectured on political economy at Columbia College, and contributed to the *North American* and other reviews articles upon law, literature, art, and diplomacy. Subsequently he formed a partnership with Hamilton Fish, earned a reputation for arguing questions involving abstruse principles of jurisprudence, and interested himself in public enterprises and improvements, the Erie Railway and High Bridge among others owing much to his zealous activity. In 1850 he removed to Newport, where he resided thereafter, was elected by the Democratic party Lieutenant-Governor of Rhode Island and soon after became Governor. The next year he was a defeated candidate for the latter position, and never afterwards held public office, though he was more or less active in the political counsels of his party, and did more than any one else to confer dignity upon its hopeless numerical inferiority in his adopted State. His main title to remembrance, however, is not at all political, but rests upon his authority as a student and expositor of international law. In this branch of his profession he had no contemporary superior in this country, and the results of his labors in its different ramifications are embodied in treatises on 'Visitation and Search' and on 'Disabilities of American Women Married Abroad' among various others, his editions of Wheaton's 'Elements of International Law,' his annotations to the second of which greatly exceeded the original publication, and an exhaustive work of his own on the same subject in French, the third volume of which has appeared, but which his death probably leaves incomplete. His arguments before the Joint Commission appointed by the Treaty of Washington and a course of lectures delivered at the Columbian University in Washington, where he had distinguished audiences, were the most important of his recent labors.

—A recent issue of the Bulletin of the Census Office shows approximately the distribution of the population of the United States, according to elevation above sea-level, in 1870 and 1880. The following is the portion of the table which relates to the present population of the country:

Grades of Elevation. Feet.	Area—Square Miles.	Population.	Pop. per Sq. M.	Percentage of total.	Percentage below each Grade.
0 to 100	181,000	9,152,003	50.3	18.25	18.25
100 to 500	410,000	10,775,250	26.3	21.48	39.73
500 to 1,000	554,300	19,025,617	34.7	37.93	77.66
1,000 to 1,500	367,400	7,903,811	21.5	15.76	93.42
1,500 to 2,000	180,000	1,876,885	10.4	3.74	97.16
2,000 to 3,000	293,500	664,851	2.2	1.33	98.49
3,000 to 4,000	234,000	128,348	0.5	0.26	98.75
4,000 to 5,000	282,400	166,545	0.6	0.34	99.09
5,000 to 6,000	200,000	271,321	1.4	0.54	99.63
6,000 to 7,000	153,000	94,989	0.6	0.19	99.82
7,000 to 8,000	78,000	15,053	0.2	0.03	99.85
8,000 to 9,000	43,000	24,947	0.6	0.05	99.90
9,000 to 10,000	24,000	26,846	0.9	0.05	99.95
Above 10,000	25,000	26,400	1.3	0.05	100.00

From this table it appears that nearly one-fifth of the population of the country lives at 100 feet or less above sea-level. This includes most of our sea-coast towns and cities, and the immediate sea-board of the northeastern States, with the low coast and the swamp regions of the middle and south Atlantic and the Gulf States, as well as most of the alluvial regions of Louisiana, nearly all of Florida and Delaware, and the Eastern Shore of Maryland. In the next grade, 100 to 500 feet, is comprised rather more than one-fifth of the population. It includes the greater part of the population of the Atlantic and Gulf States, excepting those on the immediate sea-board. In the South the proportion within this grade is decidedly greater than in the North. Besides the remainder of Florida, Mississippi, and Louisiana, this grade comprises all of Alabama and Georgia excepting the mountainous sections. It covers a broad belt in Texas and nearly all of Arkansas, while Western Kentucky and Tennessee, Southern Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, and Southeastern Missouri also contribute to it. Excepting the population on the immediate sea-coast, it comprises the principal part of the population of California and Oregon. Nearly all of the cotton, sugar, and rice-belt of the South is comprised in this and the preceding grades. Between 500 and 1,000 feet are found upwards of 19,000,000, or more than one-third of the population, making altogether more than three-fourths of

the people of the country who are living below 1,000 feet. The contour at 1,500 feet above the sea is practically the upper limit of population in that part of the country east of the 98th meridian. The great prairie region of the Mississippi valley and the Northwest, which produces the greater part of the grain product of the country, lies between 500 and 1,500 feet above the sea. No less than 97 per cent. of the total population live below 2,000 feet, while only 56 per cent. of the national area is thus involved. The area between 2,000 and 3,000 feet corresponds generally with the debatable ground between the arid region of the Cordilleran plateau on the west and the fertile valley of the Mississippi on the east. It forms a barrier beyond which dense settlement will never pass. Of the three per cent. of population remaining above this grade, nearly one-half is in this debatable land, where, during some seasons, irrigation is required for maturing crops, in others not. Beyond 3,000 feet the mass of the population is between the contours of 4,000 and 6,000, which include most of the plains and valleys—i.e., the inhabitable portions—of the Cordilleran plateau. Within these grades is the line of settlements along the eastern base of the Rocky Mountains, and the Mormon settlements in the great basin. The small bodies of population at still greater elevations are entirely composed of mining settlements, and are located mainly in Colorado, New Mexico, Nevada, and California.

—The density of population is naturally greatest in the lowest grade, where there is, in the Northern and Middle Atlantic States, a very large urban population. The next greatest density is between 500 and 1,000 feet, in which are situated the large cities of the prairie States. Since 1870 there has been, of course, an increase of population in all the grades, while the movement has been slightly toward the greater elevations. The first three grades have not held their own proportionally, as the others have gained at their expense. The percentages of absolute increase are as follows:

0 to 100.....	.27 per cent.	4,000 to 5,000.....	.98 per cent.
100 to 500.....	.25 "	5,000 to 6,000.....	1.00 "
500 to 1,000.....	.26 "	6,000 to 7,000.....	.62 "
1,000 to 1,500.....	.41 "	7,000 to 8,000.....	1.39 "
1,500 to 2,000.....	.58 "	8,000 to 9,000.....	2.37 "
2,000 to 3,000.....	.84 "	9,000 to 10,000.....	37.35 "
3,000 to 4,000.....	.62 "	Above 10,000.....	49.57 "

Between 1,000 and 3,000 the increase is mainly from immigration to the new and heretofore unsettled regions of Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and Dakota, while the increase in the higher grades is due almost entirely to the newly-awakened interest in mining in the States and Territories of the Cordilleran plateau. A computation based upon the rather insufficient data at hand shows that the mean elevation of the population of the United States is about 700 feet, while the mean elevation of the surface is approximately 2,600 feet.

—Dr. Damrosch has brought the third season of the Symphony Society to a very satisfactory conclusion. The sixth and last concert, which took place on Saturday, was, both as regards the arrangement of the programme and the performance, by far the best which has been given by the Society this winter. The opening number was Wagner's overture to the "Flying Dutchman," a composition which in length and character resembles rather a symphonic poem than an orchestral introduction to an opera. Signor Galassi followed with a scene from the same opera, which he rendered with exquisite taste. The novelty of the performance was Berlioz's setting of Béranger's celebrated ode on the death of Napoleon, "Le Cinq Mai," which, on its first performance in France, at the time when the Emperor's remains were brought from St. Helena, caused a profound sensation. The composition is long and of a somewhat monotonously gloomy character. Signor Galassi undertook the vocal part, with the assistance of a chorus of male voices, but the work nevertheless failed to produce a favorable impression on the attentive audience. A brilliant performance of Berlioz's "Carnaval Romain" and of Beethoven's Seventh Symphony terminated the concert.

—The Charleston *News and Courier* professes to have seen "a sample of the letter-paper used by a prominent lawyer" of South Carolina, "in his general correspondence," with the following imprint:

"OFFICE OF _____,
_____, S. C., 188 .

"To Colonel _____:
"DEAR COLONEL:—"

The editor infers from this that a clear majority of the male population of the State must be colonels, and from an historical retrospect of the growth of military titles in this country—from the "leftenant" of the Revolution to the grade recognized in the letter-sheet—concludes that the time is not far off when invention must supply "an easy American word indicative of a higher military rank than any we now possess." Those who remember the era of captains and majors know by experience that there has been a real progress as described, but in South Carolina it appears to have been less rapid than in the newer region of the Northwest. Has the *News* never heard the story of the puzzled foreigner, travelling eastward from the Pacific coast, who found himself at every stage accosted by an inferior title, until at

Chicago he was simply a Colonel? His curiosity to learn whether his appearance justified a military appellation was rewarded by the reply: "No, you don't look much like a General, but I allow you might be a Judge."

—A work entitled 'Grundriss der Neuisländischen Grammatik,' by William H. Carpenter (Leipzig: Bernhard Schlicke), is, we believe, the first grammar of modern Icelandic ever composed in a tongue foreign to the author's own, and also deserves notice as the work of a young American scholar who has mastered both Icelandic and German. The most eminent Icelandic scholars in Germany have paid high compliments to Mr. Carpenter, both for the accuracy of his work and for the classical German in which it is written. Mr. Carpenter is, we understand, only twenty-seven years old; he graduated from the Utica (N. Y.) Free Academy in 1871, went to Cornell University in 1877, where his attention was drawn to the Norse languages by Professor Fiske; and to Europe in 1878, where he still remains, dividing his time between Germany and Iceland. The work contains an introduction of 14 pages, a grammar of 94 pages, and an appendix of 36 pages, containing a few lessons in reading and a vocabulary. The grammar is based on Wimmer's 'Grammar of Old Norse,' with merely such changes as the circumstances required, thus forming an excellent appendix to Dr. Wimmer's able work.

LIFE OF LORD CAMPBELL.—II.*

LORD CAMPBELL'S memoirs are an important contribution to the understanding of history. To our direct knowledge, indeed, either of the public course of political events or of the private springs of political action, his letters and his autobiography contribute nothing. He was a canny Scotchman, and perhaps never committed to paper all that he knew. His life is published within twenty years of his death, and his editors have probably kept back much that he committed to paper. Whatever be the cause, the Life does not reveal a single fact of importance not already known to the whole world. Yet for all this the book adds a good deal to our comprehension of the age in which Campbell lived. The difficulty in the intelligent study of the past is to seize and understand alterations in opinion, in modes of thought. To enable us to overcome this difficulty there is nothing on earth so valuable as biography. But of all kinds of biography the most valuable is autobiography, and of all species of autobiography the most valuable is the unconscious autobiography of an assiduous letter-writer. For the purpose, further, of entering into the spirit of by-gone years the letters of a commonplace man are of more importance than the letters of a person of originality. Genius, it has been constantly said, is of all times. The converse has been scarcely sufficiently remarked—that genius is of no particular time. To know an age is to understand the feelings of a crowd of ordinary men, who think the ordinary thoughts, who express themselves in the common forms of their generation. It is to the writings of every-day men, to the "Paston Letters" (so to speak) of a period, that critics turn with the greatest avidity. Campbell was, as we have already pointed out, an ordinary man of extraordinary vigor. His letters and autobiography are, therefore, exactly the productions which historical investigators often sigh for in vain. Not only professed students, but any educated reader who cares really to understand the past, will find in what Campbell says, and even in what he does not say, a key to much that perplexes every one who wishes in a measure to solve the perpetual problem, Wherein was it that consist the strange likeness and the equally strange unlikeness between the age of Pitt, during which Campbell passed his youth, and the age of Palmerston, in which he died?

One homely truth, for example, which all persons are constantly forgetting, is forced by Campbell's memoirs on the most inattentive reader: great events do not make great men. If ever there was an era which appears at a distance like an heroic age, it is the time when the whole strength of England was pitted in a struggle for life and death against the power of revolutionary and imperial France. It is difficult not to imagine that men were then of an heroic mould, and that even the run of mankind were lifted for a moment out of the well-worn ruts of commonplace existence. All such pleasing illusions are dispelled by the biography of the Scotch lawyer. He was not careless of public affairs; he enlisted among the volunteers; he thought it possible at one moment that he might be called into active service. But of the statesmanship and of the statesmen of his day he has little to tell save that their aims and their capacity were equally below the need of a gigantic national crisis. Take this passage at random from his correspondence; it is written in 1803:

"There is nothing stirring in the political world. Addington becomes more popular. Pitt continues in ignominious retirement. Fox is making ineffectual attempts to force his wife into company. Parties are in a sad state. I see no chance of war being speedily renewed, notwithstanding the vapoing on both sides."

In 1803, in short, as at most other times, mediocrity and pettiness rule

* 'Life of John, Lord Campbell, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain. Edited by his daughter, the Hon. Mrs. Hardcastle.' In a vols. London: John Murray.

the world. A little later we find that "Pitt still clings to place with a convulsive grasp. Old Harry Dundas has got into a confounded hobble by the tenth report. No one is so pleased with it as the King. . . . It clearly appears that Dundas, in violation of a positive statute, allowed Trotter to play with the public money to a most monstrous amount and shared in the profits." So much for an age of heroes. A fancy, however, lingers in one's mind that the revolutionary leaders of France—the men whose deeds made the world turn pale—had, to compensate for their vices, a certain kind of fiendish greatness. Impressed with this idea, one scans with intense curiosity Campbell's account of his visit to France in 1802. The guillotine had, after all, not destroyed the whole of the revolutionists. Scores of them were still to be seen at Paris, and Campbell was just the man to thrust himself into any society a sight of which might gratify his curiosity. This is what he saw:

"Our visit to Tallien was a very curious one. We talked very coolly with him concerning the massacres of September, but nothing astonished me so much as the conversation that took place concerning his wife. You know she divorced him, and has since lived with a variety of other men. Yet he talked of her beauty, of her wit, of her amiable manners, of having been calling upon her, and of doing her the pleasure to introduce me to her acquaintance. There are many things here to make a Scotsman stare."

Meanwhile, what were the interests of our particular Scotchman, whose ordinary existence might, one imagines, be elevated by the influences of a memorable time? Is his mind filled with concern for the public welfare? Not at all. His thoughts are centred on the all-important question of entering the office of Tidd, the conveyancer. His chief regret at the renewal of war is that it deprives him of a projected tour on the Continent. In this instance we have no quarrel with Campbell. Ordinary life is made up of ordinary things. No national crisis really diverts, or can divert, the majority of mankind from the matters which concern them—that is, from their personal affairs.

Moreover, the time for political enthusiasm in England was not the period of the struggle with France, but the crisis in which Englishmen carried through in their own way that pacific English revolution which is known by the name of the Reform Bill. The acutest of modern political critics has pointed out that the present generation hardly understand the sentiments of 1832. There are certainly few things in history harder fully to grasp than the sudden enthusiasm for reform which surprised both reformers and the nation itself. The truth, perhaps, is that the rule of Toryism was itself a deviation from the natural course of English progress, and that the outburst of zeal for innovation was really not so much a desire for change as satisfaction at a return to the ideas which were beginning to prevail throughout the country before the outbreak of the French war. It is also probable that the very force of Tory sentiment had allowed abuses to accumulate to an absolutely unbearable extent, and that the ardor with which the nation longed for a new order of things is a pretty fair measure of the force with which every effort at political improvement had been suppressed for forty years. However this may be, it is quite certain that at the reform crisis people's political sentiments changed with a rapidity which surprised those who themselves experienced the process of conversion. Campbell's letters supply a curious proof of a change which must have gone on in the minds of many other persons. He was what would now be called a very moderate Liberal. Though connected by his work in the press with the Whig party, he does not seem, till a year or two before the Reform Bill, to have enrolled himself regularly amongst the Opposition. On February 27, 1831, Campbell writes to his brother:

"You are much too Radical for me. Anything which amounts to the formation of a new constitution I shall oppose, as I hold the formation of a new constitution to be an impossibility, and there has as yet been no instance of it in the world. A constitution may be modified and improved, but it must spring from time and accident, and not from design."

The dogma that in politics chance is a better guide than foresight is a curious piece of Eldonian philosophy, but no one can suppose that the writer who propounds it was ripe for Radical innovations. On March 1 the Reform Bill is introduced; on March 2 Campbell still writes as a stanch Tory: "You must be Radical indeed if the Ministers have not satisfied you. We are quite appalled. There is not the remotest chance of such a bill being carried by this or any House of Commons." A day later: "The general belief is that the bill must be thrown out on the second reading. I expect Ministers will then resign and anarchy begin. I feel inclined, as a choice of evils, to support and even to speak in favor of the bill." Campbell did support the bill; he did speak in favor of it. He became the law officer of the reformed Cabinet. In less than a week he was transformed from a Tory into a modern Liberal. Are we to put the change down simply to interest? We are no admirers of Campbell, but we doubt whether the most obvious explanation of his conduct is the true one. He had plenty of foes and rivals; he lived in a time of vehement party spirit; but he was not held guilty of rattling. The truth seems to be that Campbell's interests jumped with a genuine change of sentiment. What happened to him happened to thousands of other men. Almost unconsciously the whole of a generation had changed their political

tone. Respect for Eldon had been changed into admiration for Brougham. Men desired a new era. The Conservative reaction produced by the French Revolution was at an end. The Reform Bill startled the House of Commons, but it was hailed with satisfaction by the nation, and persons who had scarcely dared to breathe to themselves their own desire for changes in church and state suddenly spoke out when they found that thousands shared their wishes.

The Reform Bill and the welcome it met with were rather the sign than the cause of a revolution. If hard-headed men like Campbell were converted in a week, the cause of the phenomenon lies partly in the gradual sapping of the Tory creed which had gone on for fifteen or twenty years, partly in the contagious effect of general enthusiasm. Englishmen of 1880 hardly understand the men of 1832, because the pacific Whig revolution has swept away the evils hatred to which generated something like revolutionary fervor. It is probable, indeed, that the aggregate capacity for enthusiasm is about equal in different ages. It is quite certain, however, that different generations are excited to interest or enthusiasm by different topics. Throughout Lord Campbell's life one may trace the existence, even in the mind of a very cool-headed and unenthusiastic man, of sentiments which hardly exert much influence on even enthusiastic Englishmen of the present day. But one should carefully note, on the other hand, that the generation of which Campbell was the commonplace representative certainly did not share in some moral and intellectual interests which tell with irresistible force on modern Englishmen or Americans. From the beginning to the end of Lord Campbell's life you will find scarcely an allusion to religious or to theological speculation. He probably shared the opinions of his father-in-law, who, after having spent his life in bamboozling juries, solemnly records the obviously sincere conviction that the truths of Christianity were established on grounds so clear that they could not fail to commend themselves to the judgment of twelve unbiassed jurymen. Lord Abinger was, in his way, a very able man indeed. Campbell, though without a touch of genius, possessed an amount of hard common sense of which few men can boast. It is highly probable that in any case such men might be little inclined to theological speculation or scepticism. What, however, is worth noting is that they both took up quite naturally an attitude towards religious scepticism which could hardly be occupied in the present day by two men of equal force of character. Here, as elsewhere, one learns the one essential lesson to be gathered from biographical history, that not so much definite opinions as the whole attitude of mankind towards political, scientific, or theological doctrines will be found to differ from age to age, and may change fundamentally within the lifetime of one individual.

MARTIN'S 'THE CHINESE.'*

THIS volume contains fifteen papers intimately connected with the intellectual condition and political prospects of the Chinese. Those who are interested in learning some of the mental features of this great and active mass of people, now rapidly advancing in their knowledge of science and religion, will sincerely thank Dr. Martin for thus rendering them accessible. Fifty years ago the French orientalist, M. Abel Rémusat, collected a second series of his own papers upon topics relating to Eastern lands, which he called 'Mélanges Asiatiques,' the four volumes together making a worthy monument of the learning, accuracy, and good sense of their author. The contrast in the position of China now and when those papers were issued ought to convince the most sceptical as to the possibility of her advance in everything which makes a nation great. Another equally suggestive contrast, indicating the altered state of the Eastern world, is to be found in the circumstances which have called forth Mr. George F. Seward's work on 'Chinese Immigration,' designed to show the impolicy and injustice of the opposition to the Chinese coming to or remaining in this country. Its author was recently the representative of American diplomacy at Peking; while Dr. Martin, at the head of the college at the same time, illustrated the learning and philanthropy of his native country.

This volume is appropriately dedicated to Prof. William D. Whitney, and in a prefatory note its author informs him that most of the essays have been already published in China under the title of 'Hanlin Papers,' and are now "offered to you and the public only as a bundle of *Beiträge*—a small contribution towards the better understanding of China and the Chinese." Out of the seventeen papers four are likely to attract the most attention in this country, though all will be valuable to students in China itself. These are "Competitive Examinations in China," "The Ethical Philosophy of the Chinese," "The Renaissance in China," and "The Worship of Ancestors in China." In all of them the remarkable versatility of their author attracts attention, and his manner of weaving in references to European and classical literature by quotation, illustration, and argument gives picturesqueness to the style and suggests new trains of thought. It is now more than thirty years since he reached China as a missionary in the employ of the American

* 'The Chinese: their Education, Philosophy, and Letters. By W. A. P. Martin, D.D., LL.D., President of the Tungwen College, Peking.' New York: Harper & Brothers. 1881. 6vo, pp. 320.

Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions. This church had established a large and active mission at Ningpo as early as 1845, and already had schools, a hospital, chapel, printing-office, and foundry in successful operation. Here Dr. Martin remained about ten years in connection with it, and then moved to Peking in 1863 to open a new mission, in which he was ere long joined by associates, who still carry it on. In 1869 he was invited by the Chinese Foreign Office to take entire charge of the *Tungwen Kwan*, or College of United Literature, which had been founded about five years before, but had languished and somewhat discouraged its patron for want of a suitable head. He soon revived it, and has since made it an institution useful to its supporters and creditable to its faculty. He refers to its formation on page 95, and describes the neat way in which the serious opposition to it, as a dangerous innovation of foreign origin, was neutralized by the Emperor requiring its critics to do better, and giving their leader, Wo-jin, at that time the Prime Minister, a *carte-blanc* to carry out their wishes. They had neither inclination nor ability to take up the gauntlet thrown down to them.

Such are Dr. Martin's antecedents. His title to a hearing on the subjects he has taken in hand is indisputable. We shall not, however, be expected to discuss the merits of these essays, and we limit ourselves to noticing a few points. The analysis, in that on "Ethical Philosophy," of a chart prepared by a native scholar to give his disciples a synopsis of the entire range of human obligations, opens to our view a singular effort of an inquisitive mind to classify knowledge. It naturally touches such a wide range of subjects in the effort to follow out the plan of the chart that his pupils must have been more wearied than instructed. In explaining its scope Dr. Martin gives the following summary:

"On this chart we have a projection of the national mind. It indicates the high grade in the scale of civilization attained by the people among whom it originated, exhibiting all the elements of an elaborate socialism. Political ethics are skilfully connected with private morals, and the virtues and vices are marshalled in a vast array, which required an advanced state of society for their development.

"The accuracy with which these various traits of character are noted implies the same thing; and the correctness of the moral judgments here recorded infers something more than culture—it discloses a grand fact of our nature, that, whatever may be thought of innate ideas, it contains inherent principles which produce the same fruits in all climates.

"It would be superfluous to vindicate the Chinese from the charge of mental inferiority in the presence of that immense social and political organization which has held together so many millions of people for so many thousands of years: and especially of arts, now dropping their golden fruits into the lap of our own civilization, whose roots can be traced to the soil of that ancient empire. But a strange defect must be admitted in the national mind. We think, however, that it is more in its development than in its constitution, and may be accounted for by the influence of education. If we include in that term all the influences that affect the mind, the first place is due to language; and a language whose primary idea is the representation of the objects of sense, and which is so imperfect a vehicle of abstract thought that it is incapable of expressing by single words such ideas as space, quality, relation, etc., must have seriously obstructed the exercise of the intellect in that direction. A servile reverence for antiquity, which makes it sacrilege to alter the crude systems of the ancients, increased the difficulty; and the Government brought it to the last degree of aggravation by admitting, in the public-service examinations, a very limited number of authors, with their expositors, to whose opinions conformity is encouraged by honors, and from whom dissent is punished by disgrace. These fetters can only be stricken off by the hand of Christianity; and we are not extravagant in predicting that a stupendous intellectual revolution will attend its progress" (pp. 145-148).

This extract exhibits an instance of rather careless reasoning which is not unique in these papers. For, if the Chinese mind has been hampered to such a degree by the language it has been obliged to employ to develop its ideas, that it has no words to express some ideas, while the result of the ideas it has developed has been the immense organization which has held together for so many thousands of years, how could the Government, whose members were trained only in this language and its ideas, adopt other texts and other authors than those familiar to its people? Would Dr. Martin have their examiners take authors they had never heard of, and which were written in languages they could not read? He seems to expect results without adequate causes.

In his paper on ancestral worship we find much that is suggestive respecting the position of this important feature of the national faith, its influence on the national character, and its relation to Christian doctrine. His inclination to explain away its subtle and deep opposition to the demands of the Bible, by making it merely the ceremonial of filial duty, is like that of Ricci and other missionaries of the Roman Catholic Church. Every one conversant with their discussions will recognize the same views that the Jesuits upheld, and which have found advocates ever since. Dr. Martin thus refers to its favorable results upon the social life of the Chinese:

"The worship of ancestors strengthens the ties of kinship, and binds together those family and tribal groups on which the Government so much relies for the control of its individual subjects. The family temple serves for a church, theatre, school-house, council-room, and indeed for all the varied objects required by the exigencies of a village community. Domains attached to it for the maintenance of the sacrifices are held as common property, and

glebe-lands are often appended which are devoted to the support of needy members of the widely-extended connection. I have seen a town of twenty-five thousand people all belonging to the same clan and bearing the same family name. A conspicuous edifice near the centre bore the name of *Shetsu Miao*—i.e., temple of our First Ancestor. Here the divergent branches of the family-tree met in a common root, and all the citizens, under the cloud of incense arising from a common sacrifice, were led to feel the oneness of their origin, though separated it might be by half a millennium. Such a village represents the growth of a banyan-tree—the most distant column in the living arcade, though resting on a root of its own, still maintaining a vital connection with the parent stock.

"Aside from its social and economic relations, this form of worship exerts a religious and moral influence beyond any other system of doctrine hitherto known to the Chinese Empire. In a sceptical world, and through ages not favored with that revelation which has 'brought life and immortality to light,' it has kept alive the faith in a future life. The orthodox son of Han regards himself as living and acting in the sight of his ancestors. He refers his conduct to their supposed judgment, and the comfort of his dying hour is largely determined by the view he takes of the kind of welcome he is likely to receive when he meets the shades of his forefathers. 'How could I look my ancestors in the face if I should consent to such a proposition?' is a reply which many an officer has given to a temptation to betray his trust. A motive which has such power to deter from baseness may also be potent as a stimulus to good; indeed, in respect to moral efficacy it would appear to be only second to that of faith in the presence of an all-seeing Deity" (pp. 266, 267).

After these utterances we are quite prepared to hear the writer's conclusion that "when the higher classes come to embrace Christianity in great numbers, they will readily leave behind them their Buddhism and their Taoism; but the worship of ancestors they will never consent to abandon, though they may submit to some such modifications as those which I have endeavored to indicate."

There is one negative feature of these essays which has attracted our attention. Considering that their author went to China as a missionary, and has been engaged in proselyting and educational labors for thirty years, he here shows much less faith in the transforming power of Christianity than we should have expected. His trust appears to lie in a different direction. "The doctrine of the balance of power, formerly limited in its application to the map of Europe, is now transferred to Eastern Asia, and it is under the shield of this principle alone that either China or Japan can hope to maintain her independence, or to go forward in that career of progress on which both have so auspiciously entered." We might also have looked for some references to the enormous difficulties to be overcome by the government and people of the Middle Kingdom in their attempts to elevate themselves to the standing he desires. A word of consideration would have come naturally for their disadvantages in the struggle, arising from ignorance, bad and weak government, and heathenism at home; as well as the overmastering power of outer nations which has forced from them the principle of extraterritoriality that tends to interfere in everything in the internal administration. A careful and encouraging summary of what China has attempted during the last twelve years is added to the paper on the Renaissance; and its record is answer enough to the foreigners who clamor for rapid material progress chiefly in order that they may profit by carrying it out.

THE LAW OF RAILROADS.*

THE law of railroads is of comparatively recent growth. The editor of a digest has to go back only fifty years to cover all the cases upon a subject which now constitutes a well-defined body of law. Against 23 miles of railroad in the United States in 1830 there are now 85,000 miles. Within the ten years from 1870 to 1880 the average annual increase in lines of road was about 4,000 miles, to which it had steadily risen, the number of miles laid in 1879 exceeding that of any previous year since the "railroad years" of 1870-3. Of course such an enormous growth in the subject and nucleus of possible litigation caused, both in England and the United States, a corresponding increase in the number of railroad statutes and decisions. One railway alone (the London and Northwestern) has required for its regulation no less than two hundred acts, while the railroad cases are numbered by thousands.

Mr. Pierce's book, though entitled a "treatise," is, for the most part, an abridged digest, or, as stated in his preface, "a compact statement of the law of railroads." Some parts of the work are of especial interest and usefulness to the business public, notably the chapters on "Municipal Subscriptions" (pp. 87-109) and "The Capital Stock" (pp. 110-129). For some years it has been the custom of railroad companies to procure, under legislative authority, corporate subscriptions to their stock from the different counties through which the proposed line was to run. The proposition would be submitted to popular vote, and in sparsely-settled districts the inhabitants were easily induced, under the belief that great advantages would accrue to them,

* A Treatise on the Law of Railroads. By Edward L. Pierce. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1881.

from the locating and working of a railroad in their vicinity, to pledge the credit of their county for hundreds of thousands of dollars, the subscription being paid for by an issue of county bonds to the amount subscribed. These bonds were often put upon the market by the county authorities at rates much below their face-value, the proceeds going to the railroad companies, who were thus provided with the ready money necessary to push their schemes. All went well until the people began to feel the weight of the special tax imposed to pay off the interest coupons, and were led to reflect that this would be terribly increased when the bonds ran out and the principal fell due. Straightway counties which had rashly incurred liabilities amounting to thousands set to work to find pretexts for avoiding payment of the hundreds due as interest. All sorts of technical defences were raised, and in some States judges owed their elevation to the bench mainly to the popular belief that they entertained opinions adverse to the validity of the bonds. In the Circuit Courts of the United States, however, men like Judges Woods and Wallace promptly suppressed such "indecent defences," and declared that where the legislature had given a county power to make such subscriptions, and bonds had been issued in payment, containing upon their face a recital, signed by a duly-authorized official, to the effect that the conditions necessary to their issue had been complied with, the good faith essential to all commercial transactions forbade the counties to go behind such a certificate and prove latent defects in their issue against parties who had purchased the securities for value, relying upon the good faith of the counties which had issued them. This sound and honest conclusion was upheld by the Supreme Court of the United States. It has been left for the highest appellate court of this State to put forth, in a case decided a few weeks ago, a contrary doctrine. What effect this decision will have upon an important class of negotiable securities it is impossible accurately to foretell; but investors should be warned that Virginia is not the only State where a doctrine of repudiation has secured judicial encouragement. If this opinion had been published a month earlier it would doubtless have led Mr. Pierce to modify the statements in his paragraph on "Conclusive Acts and Certificates" at p. 104.

In the chapter upon "Eminent Domain," treating of the remedy afforded a land-owner whose property has been "injuriously affected" by the "operation" of a railroad, the author states accurately the law as it obtains in this country, but fails to note certain interesting distinctions between the statutory remedy in the United States and in England, such as we should have expected to find appended to the three pages which he devotes to the "Land Clauses Consolidation Act" and the "Railway Clauses Consolidation Act," passed by Parliament in 1845. As one would naturally infer from the temper of that body, the land-owner's rights, as against the corporation, are far more jealously guarded by the elaborate provisions of those statutes than by any similar enactments in this country. For example, although the statement undoubtedly holds good here, it is certainly incorrect to say that in England a land-owner can recover no compensation for the loss of business and good-will without any of his land being taken (p. 209). For the English courts have held that where, in the construction of a railway, the approach to a shop has been made inconvenient the owner could recover compensation for the falling-off of his trade.

On the other hand, when we come to decisions relating to personal injuries caused by railway accidents we find that the leaning has been the other way; and in our earlier "injury" cases complaints which in England would have been promptly dismissed by the court were allowed to go to the jury, at whose hands a verdict against the company was pretty sure to carry a round sum by way of damages. So marked became this probability that the corporations—which the plaintiff's attorney invariably took pains to stigmatize as "soulless harpies," "fleshless, bloodless, intangible creations"—were forced to secure the passage of acts limiting their liability in cases of death by accident. So that, whilst in England under a similar statute (Lord Campbell's Act) the surviving widow and children may obtain damages, computed with reference to the rank and wealth of the deceased husband and father, in this State the law will not admit the interest in the life of a Vanderbilt to be worth to his widow or child more than \$5,000. Ex-Judge Porter wittily characterized this tendency to favor the individual as against the corporation in one of his arguments for the Elevated Railroad, where he said that matters had come to such a pass that "to be a corporation was negligence *per se*!" This excessive leaning on the part of juries against the railroad, in actions for personal injuries, doubtless developed to an extreme degree the defence of "contributory" negligence; and the reaction in the courts of England, Massachusetts, and perhaps New York, against the rigid application of that doctrine, without attempting the confusing method, which prevails in some of the Western States, of trying to balance off the different degrees of negligence, bids fair to modify within reasonable limits what seemed likely to become the inflexible rule, that any act on the part of the plaintiff which contributed in the slightest degree to cause the accident would suffice to defeat his recovery. This reactionary tendency can be plainly seen in the judgments delivered by Lord Penzance and his colleagues in the late case of *Radley vs. The London and Northwestern Railway*, to which Mr. Pierce

refers in his margin (p. 324), but without noticing the important deduction to be drawn from it.

Again, as Mr. Pierce remarks (p. 279), the doctrine once obtained that the company could not be held liable for the wilful wrong of their servants—a rule which involved much uncertainty and led to embarrassing conflicts of judicial opinion. A clear definition of the liability of railroad companies for the conduct of conductors, brakemen, and the like, whose employment brought them into direct contact, and often into conflict, with the public, was found to be absolutely necessary. It was soon seen that employees frequently performed their duties in an aggressive, overbearing, and injurious manner, and sometimes even took the opportunity to vent personal spite under the guise of official acts. So that early in the history of railroad law it became necessary for the protection of travellers to demand of the company that it should exercise such care in the selection of its servants, and supervise them so watchfully, that the latter would not perform their duties to the injury of the passenger. It has thus become the rule to hold the company responsible for wilful injuries done by employees under the pretence of performing a duty or carrying out orders. It requires no trained mind to perceive at once the necessity and soundness of such a rule.

We have failed to find in Mr. Pierce's work any allusion to the recent decisions relating to "palace-cars" and "sleeping-cars"—cases of importance to travellers in this country, accustomed to "cross-continent" journeys, and, since the introduction of the "Pullman coach" in England, of interest to travellers on some of the lines of railway there. It is well to bear in mind the peculiar arrangement under which this class of cars is run, the company who own them paying a fixed tariff to the railroad company, and employing their own conductors, porters, etc., and yet being subject to the general management and control of the train-conductor and the servants of the railroad company. Thus, whilst the latter is liable for accidents to the passengers resulting from negligence in managing and running the trains, it is not bound to watch over the luggage which the traveller takes into such cars with him. At the same time the traveller's chances of recovery for the loss of valuables so carried, in an action against the "sleeping-car" company, are slight. Its liability is not that of a "common carrier" nor an "inn-keeper." So that the common practice of hanging one's clothing upon a hook at the head of the berth would seem to be at the owner's peril.

A Popular History of the United States: From the first discovery of the Western Hemisphere by the Northmen to the end of the Civil War. Preaded by a sketch of the prehistoric period and the age of the Mound-Builders. By William Cullen Bryant and Sydney Howard Gay. Vol. iv. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1881.)—In reviewing the first volume of this history (see the *Nation*, No. 592) we expressed the expectation that "Mr. Bryant's own recollections of the anti-slavery contest" would be "the most valuable and characteristic feature of the entire work." Mr. Bryant's regretted death has, of course, disappointed this expectation; nevertheless, we were not without hope that he had put upon record some of these recollections, and left them as materials in the composition of the present volume. This, however, appears not to have been the case. But it is a real occasion for surprise and regret that this part of the history, which we expected to be freshest and most instructive, is precisely the most meagre and least satisfactory of the whole. The want of proportion in the composition of the book, of which we complained at the first, has made it necessary to crowd into this volume the events of eighty-five years, and to put us off with a bare sketch where we needed the fullest and most graphic narration. No political contest in history can compare in importance and in picturesque interest with those which led to the Civil War, except the Fall of the Roman Republic and the English Civil War of the seventeenth century; but the ten years before the war are dismissed in little over thirty pages, in which two so important events as the Ostend Manifesto and the Personal Liberty Bills are not even mentioned. When a German historian promises to complete a work in four volumes, all the world knows that the four volumes will hardly contain his introduction, and that he will go lumbering along, adding new volumes as long as he lives. We do not like this method; but as little do we like an original plan so persistently followed as to destroy all proportion in the work and injure some parts of it by hurried and incomplete work. One is struck throughout the volume with the embarrassment experienced by the editor in the endeavor to make use of his new and interesting material without overrunning his limits; so that, while the volume as a whole is rather a sketch than a history, certain portions give almost the effect of elaborate monographs upon special points. A very interesting example of this is the account (p. 140) of the intrigues with Miranda in 1799, and the contemplated attack upon New Orleans, then in the possession of Spain. This episode is barely mentioned by Hildreth—and that without any comprehension of its real character—and appears from a note on page 143 to be essentially a new piece of information.

The haste of composition, or rather the oppressive sense of the need of brevity, is noticeable in very many details. On page 280, in speaking of the election of President by the House of Representatives in 1825, it is

said that "a choice was to be made between the three highest candidates, Jackson, Adams, and Crawford"; but why no further mention is made of Crawford, and why the choice was in the end only between Jackson and Adams, does not appear. In the controversy between the State of Georgia and the Cherokees (p. 289) it is said that the Cherokees, as a foreign state, "could not bring a case before the Federal courts." Why? Art. iii. section 2 of the Constitution provides explicitly for controversies between a State and foreign states; and the eleventh amendment only excludes "citizens or subjects of any foreign state." We are left wholly in the dark as to the real ground of the plea, and also as to the decision of the court in the matter. The faction which nominated Mr. Douglas in 1860 is said (p. 432) to have "been satisfied with the platform of four years before, while the Southern delegates insisted," etc., but we can find no statement of what the platform was four years before. A question of constitutional law is tacitly decided (p. 345) in the words, "the acting President, Vice-President Tyler." But it appears to us clear that Mr. Tyler was constitutionally President. The Constitution says (Art. ii. section 6) "the same shall devolve on the Vice-President," same evidently referring to office; while below it says that in case of removal, etc., "both of the President and Vice-President" Congress shall determine "what officer shall then act as President."

One more criticism, and we are through with fault-finding. We are not of those who would have a historian devoid of human sympathies, or who believe that it is impossible to preserve impartiality side by side with a hearty sympathy for a cause or a principle. We would not have the great contest of slavery and freedom told without expressions of admiration, indignation, and rejoicing, where events call for them. Neither would we insist overmuch on the "dignity of history." But we must say that this narrative shows an occasional petulance and narrowness befitting the newspaper or the pamphlet rather than the deliberately expressed judgment of the historian. Is it true (393) that the Southern aristocracy were "an ill-born, ill-bred, uneducated, and brutal handful of slaveholders"? Is it worth while to suggest (p. 415) that President Pierce's tears at the news of the sack of Lawrence were "possibly maudlin tears"? Is it fair to say (p. 449) that the "War Democrats" joined the Republicans, while "the party they abandoned preserved its name, its organization, and its sympathies with slaveholders and rebels"? or to speak (p. 511) of "McClellan's friends, the 'Copperhead' party of the North"? Surely a man who exposed his life for the Union has a right to be called a "War Democrat."

As we remarked of the last volume, the military point is perhaps the best. The war of the Rebellion is fully and very clearly and graphically narrated. So it is with the Mexican War, the War of 1812, and the closing years of the Revolutionary War—of so many widely separated wars does this volume give the history. The intervening periods are but sketches—excellent in the main, although defective in some details. Now that Mr. Gay has completed his task, and finished Mr. Bryant's history within the limits originally set, we hope he will go on with an independent work, and give us a history of the United States from the formation of the Constitution to the present time. There is not in existence a book which covers this ground satisfactorily. We have an abundance of colonial histories, and the Revolutionary period has been fully and adequately treated. But the most important part of our history is that in regard to which it is hardest to get information. We hoped that this volume would fill the gap, but this was impossible from the nature of things. Mr. Gay has shown that he possesses the qualifications, and he has his materials collected. He could not do a better service to his country and to literature than to undertake this task with no other conditions than to make a thoroughly satisfactory work.

The New Virginians. By the author of 'Junia.' 2 vols. (Edinburgh: Blackwood; New York: Scribner & Welford.)—These entertaining volumes comprise the substance of sixteen letters written by a clever Englishwoman from Piedmont, Va., to some friend at "home." They are epistolary only in form, having been pruned of everything personal; but to American readers the interest of them will be mainly personal, and the narrative dependent upon the incidental portraiture of the narrator, which, since she is anonymous, it may be said with propriety has unusual attractiveness. She begins with her arrival at Norfolk some eight or nine years ago, we infer, accompanied by "E.," presumably her husband, and "M.," a near female relation of some sort. Proceeding to the backwoods they join "A.," who has been some time in the country, and, after a dismal experience of "boarding," build themselves a house and begin farming. They have a troubled time, and one wonders that the writer can speak of being so happy as she occasionally does, until the resources of the party in British self-respect discover themselves. They are not entertained as angels, and only ascertain after woful experience that the land has been cleared for thirty years and is expected by nobody to yield much, that pigs and cows must be shot now and then to keep others out of their preserves; that the negroes and poor whites, who are their sole neighbors, are thriftless, untrustworthy, and superstitious, and that

there is no prospect of ever getting their surroundings as much to their mind as they easily could in the home they have left behind them. The author is not only clever, as we said, but highly accomplished. She is apparently an excellent botanist, something of an entomologist, once tried her hand at dissection, has travelled widely in Europe, has a thorough understanding of music, is evidently well read, and writes very vividly and simply of what she observes with much keenness and closeness. The story of such a woman suddenly driven to washing and cooking, not only for herself but for her negro servant whenever the latter is surly, awakened from sleep by rats and mice running over her face, milking her own cow and digging holes for her grapevines, living absolutely without social intercourse with any one but negroes and "crackers," amid surroundings which depress even them profoundly, and doing it all contentedly and light-heartedly, is a story of pluck that resembles heroism and cannot fail to be interesting. It is still more interesting, however, to observe that the simple process of unconsciously reflecting that her *entourage* is not English, but American, gives a flip to her existence, and makes it at times almost exhilarating. Even the negro has in this view a stimulating effect. She explains to one with severity that he ought not to use yellow paper in writing to a lady, attends a "baptizing" and hears a funeral sermon that fill her with comfortable disgust instead of mirth, and always speaks of "niggers," not unkindly and perfectly unaware that she is using a colloquialism. The "mean whites" of the neighborhood perform the same service. Their ignorance of all adaptation of means to ends, their whimsical vulgarities and abject poverty are very well described. But we have met with nothing more amusing in a long time than the author's scorn for the claim of connection with the English aristocracy put forth by two of them, and the satire with which she exposes the hollowness of it; unless it be her almost saturnine enjoyment at the unjustifiable use which another made of a "Peerage" lent her by the author—viz., the construction of a pedigree for herself out of it. Her pictures of both whites and "niggers," it follows, are less interesting as portraiture than as a disclosure of her own attitude. Of any sympathetic quality which might give them picturesqueness they are absolutely destitute—in some instances, we are justified in assuming a well-bred Englishwoman would say, *mutatis mutandis*, even to the point of brutality. The account of a funeral in vol. i. is an instance where the faulty orthodoxy of the preacher is referred to in terms of the severest condemnation. We feel sure she had never heard the strictly American anecdote of the waiter who replied to a guest's complaint that he had found a button marked "U.S." in his hash—"What do you expect? Silk umbrellas?"

Such an attitude has its own picturesqueness, and, though it has often enough been remarked by ethnologists, it preserves a perennial charm. We fancy it must have been quickly perceived in the Virginia backwoods. The new settlers built their house without any guest-chamber, made no visits or next to none, and evidently saw no F.F.V.'s but the bogus ones they at once found out. As the author says, "It is strange how this desire to shut out intruders—for that is what it is—will cling to us English, travel as we may"; and it was probably strange to the Piedmontese. The "niggers," we think it will be surmised, found it not only strange but agreeable; since it is infallibly accompanied by a certain ingenuousness which "Aunt Caroline," at least, appears to have regarded as credulity. Others also found a willing ear in which to whisper horrors. We dwell on this because it is the only explanation of a great deal in the volumes which is uttered with as much positiveness as if the writer had had trustworthy information in regard to what she had no experience of, and as if her Piedmont experiences were typical of American manners and customs everywhere. 'Martin Chuzzlewit' she discovers to be no caricature but "a literal transcription of facts." 'Uncle Tom's Cabin,' her other source of information about America before coming here, she learned to look upon with some suspicion, we infer. American cars are disfigured by tobacco-chewers, and those railway employes called porters in England are here termed "baggage-smashers." Americans never build for posterity, and so prefer wood to brick except when brick is cheaper; always have hot bread for breakfast; drink either not at all or else immoderately, and never dilute raw spirits before drinking them; and "shoot at sight," and have no vulgar prejudices about shooting victims in the back—the large murderous class being thus particularly unmanly, it is implied. Negro suffrage is "enough to make any Southerner lie down and die" (vol. i. p. 234), and, considering the prospect that the negro race is to be the dominant one in the South, "Were I a Southern woman, mine eyes would become dim and my cheeks furrowed with weeping for the desolation of my country" (vol. ii. p. 262). The Civil-Rights bill, in volume i., is "the last instance of oppressive legislation directed against this down-trodden country," and the author doesn't understand how Judge Hilton is allowed to close his hotel to "Jews equal in wealth and standing almost to our Rothschilds and Montefiores"; in volume ii. she has learned that a hotel is legally equivalent to the owner's private house, but there is the same indignation expressed and the same reference to Rothschild and Montefiore. It does not escape her acuteness that the North, though insulting the South with this bill, does not prevent harsh treatment of the blacks at West Point, nor would "one of those Nor-

WITH an even stricter standard of selection than heretofore, the younger Society's exhibition this year is more catholic as well as more sustained. There are several canvases by painters who are commonly supposed to

be most at home at the Academy; the variety thus obtained, however, being variety of manner rather than of merit, and thus arguing that the Society has found its proper function of signalizing general excellence rather than—as, rightly or not, it has been abundantly reproached for having done—of exploiting certain definite idiosyncrasies of art. The star picture is Bastien-Le Page's "Joan of Arc," purchased for an American bonanza gallery, and a sensation at the Paris *Salon*. It is a large canvas of undisguised ambitiousness, and less original than artificial in its points of divergence from the inspiration of Millet. The face of the Maid is dramatically conceived, and if there is any genius in the picture it is here. Upon the rest, too clearly composed of accessories to allow great vitality to the *ensemble*, abundant talent is expended, and, speaking strictly, thrown away. It is not, perhaps, open to the popular imputation of oddity, which it is nevertheless easy to anticipate—indeed, there is too little genuineness in its pictorial significance to distinguish it as a freak; but it loses a certain impressiveness for the same reason, and its avoidance of the stupidities of the English Preraphaelitism, to which it is, in some sort, of spiritual kin, is only a relative advantage. Its clear-sighted consistency would be an absolute advantage in a composition by Blake, for example, upon such a theme, but it needs the accompaniment of more spirituality than Bastien-Le Page apparently possesses to make it of much service in producing a lasting impression. In fine, as it is not a great work it is a pity that it sets out to be great or nothing. In spite of much deftness of brush-work and liquidity of color we believe this much may also be said of the picture which fronts it on the opposite wall, and which is the only other work in the exhibition that challenges the ideal with equal boldness—Mr. J. Alden Weir's "Music," namely. Painters may well envy certain of its beauties, within the ability of few other men to compass; as, on the other hand, painters may suggest a slimmer right arm, more flexible wrist articulation, and more dependence on the sufficient modelling, with less on an unpleasantly obvious linear bifurcation, to indicate anatomy. But as "Music," what is the meaning of the picture? What design could have underlaid the projection of it? Nothing, surely, properly belonging to the spontaneous genesis of a large ideal work. Mr. Weir had a splendid model, or, if he had not, the Venus of Milo would have served him as well, and, casting about to utilize her charms, decided after some thought to make her a muse of music rather than of epic poetry, hunted up a lute, and painted her leaning her left arm upon it, and looking every inch a splendid animal, full and sensuous as a Titian below the chin and beneath her folds of gauze, but with the features and the whole intellectual import of melancholy vacuity. To give such material as this a twist in the direction of ideality is to exhibit a lack of intellectual seriousness; in other words, a "Music" like this is an inadequate recognition of the dignity of ideality in art, atoned for but meagrely by any possible exhibition of the resources of a palette. These Mr. Weir shows with equal distinction elsewhere, not only in his remarkable portrait of a gentleman, but in a still more remarkable flower-piece, in neither of which are they handicapped by intellectual inadequacy. It is a commonplace that he has, as nearly as possible, a clear field in that department of portrait-painting into which the former naturally falls, but the quality of his flowers is a new witness of versatility upon a high plane. The painter's acute feeling for purely sensuous subtleties is pointedly illustrated by the way in which its light harmonies are held in relation without a discord from anything tropical in which, considering the nature of the subject, a sense less keen might not perceive a jar.

The patrician portraits by Mr. Wyatt Eaton and Mr. A. H. Thayer contribute largely to the distinction of the Exhibition. Mr. Eaton sends three, of which that of the standing young lady is probably the least successful—looking, indeed, as if her statuesque pose were more a contrivance than a characterization. This distinguishes it at once from the other two, of which it would be difficult to select the more felicitous. All three are full of color, and have a luminous, rich effect which Mr. Thayer's half-dozen as noticeably lack. It is quite clear, however, that Mr. Thayer's palette is a product of natural selection, and one is perpetually surprised at the entire sufficiency of his substitution of a certain individual treatment of gray tones for an element which ordinarily seems of the essence of painting. But, all questions of painting aside, what the observer will especially remark in both his work and Mr. Eaton's this year is the high-bred air with which each face and figure is endued, and which, whatever the qualities of the sitter, is to be attained only by an intuitive perception of the qualities of style. A similar trait is illustrated in a number of low reliefs in bronze and plaster by Augustus St. Gaudens. For refined picturesqueness, which we should say is the quality that distinguishes Mr. St. Gaudens's work, there is nothing in American sculpture, if that is anything to say, that equals his portrait of Bastien-Le Page, or the medallion of two young gentlemen in the centre of the room, or the charming little head in the annex. Beside these Mr. O'Donovan's head of an Ethiopian Hercules shows itself a mistake that is almost interesting for its quaintness, though of course nothing can be more unfortunate than the error it illustrates of sacrificing fundamental sculptural conditions to secure unhappy pictorial eccentricities. Mr. O'Donovan's serious sculpture has been abundantly over-praised and abun-

dantly depreciated, but there is no possible room for doubt that he is more at home in it than in such ingenuously direct efforts after picturesqueness as this head, the mere placing of which on its stand indicates a fatal infelicity.

On the other hand, Mr. Warner's portrait-head of a lady is a master-piece in the grand style, and any purely picturesque qualities of color and movement it may possess are felt to be wholly incidental; it is not Renaissance art, but Greek, and, in respect of sculptural severity, is a work of most impressive largeness and loftiness. When it is said that together with this there is not a line of conventional beauty to be observed, but that the face is as American as the sculpture is Greek, Mr. Warner's accomplishment will be understood. The sense of measure and proportion, and at the same time of a light and bright touch dealing with a subject whose beauty is tinged with a completely modern pensiveness, is as marked as is Mr. St. Gaudens's magical touch and pictorial treatment dealing with material which naturally inclines toward them. The one other work here with which it has in this respect a clear spiritual kinship is Mr. Eakins's picture of a "Lady Singing a Pathetic Ballad." Both have a dignity definitely intellectual, in virtue of which they command the attention that intellectual work of a high order must always attract amid surroundings of a purely sensuous charm. The sensuous and sentimental note, with its various excellences, is left out of Mr. Eakins's art, and in many of his pictures its absence leaves a void which no attempt is made to fill. But here the matter is too high for such considerations to be felt; all "the intolerable pathos" of a song of Burns is what is felt. Nothing surpassing the beautiful way in which the influence of the ballad sung by the lady in the foreground melts her own heart, and impels the two accompanists to share in her emotion as far as a sensitive reticence allows, has been produced in a community where, for various reasons, it is unusual for the most "artistic" temperaments to become absolutely mastered by an idea and completely absorbed in the representation of it. The absence of any factitious alloy in Mr. Eakins's genius has here been of powerful assistance to him, and more than compensated for the frequent occasions upon which it has compelled his work to forego the wayside charms of sensuous beauty. Two other pictures have also a spiritual interest, though of a different quality—Mr. Martin's "Morning" and Mr. La Farge's "Study," of which the latter was painted eighteen years ago, we observe by the date, and the former is, perhaps, not quite painted yet. For sheer beauty Mr. Martin's landscape is unique in the display, but, like the lower-toned La Farge, its beauty is of an impalpable instead of a sensuous nature and appeals to the susceptibility only through the intellect. In an exhibition whose most eminent general characteristic is a high excellence of technical expression these two canvases owe their marked relief to an unmistakable subordination of expression to significance, and to a strength of suggestiveness accurately to be described as haunting.

Mr. Ryder's little landscape is extremely poetic and entitled to be called a gem: moreover, its obvious romanticism, which suits so well the prevalent mood of the sentimental mind, is thoroughly pure and genuine. But its main dependence is upon beauty of color; it is a color-study subtly conceived, and carried out not only with his accustomed sureness, but with an unusual distinction which testifies to his continued progress in the power of communicating the delicate fancies of which he has a store. In color, too, and quality Mr. Bunce's "Apples" reach high-water mark; nothing two hundred and fifty years old and from Flanders could be richer. The same painter's "Nebo" is, in its way, nearly as great a success, and the sky especially has a quality at once truthful and lovely. Mr. Chase sends several canvases, the largest of which has the main centre, and deserves it on moral grounds, though it serves mainly to show how a painter with the genius of energy backed by training can dignify a trifle. An interior by Mr. Dannat is not so good and more like Munkácsy, but a fruit-piece by him is a bit of superb solidity and strength. A large decorative panel by Mr. Lathrop is one of the most, we will not say attractive, but surely one of the most meritorious works of the Exhibition. Mr. Sargent stiffens into galvanism this year, Mr. Sartain's portrait is a little overloaded and opaque, and Mr. Currier's "Boy" not more interesting for being more kempt than usual. A rainy Broadway evening, by Mr. Lungren, is exceedingly clever, and doubtless Villegas would not hesitate to sign it, though the recessing in the frame is a clear affectation. Mr. Palmer's landscape is vivid and painted in cleverly-handled *impasto*. Mr. Fuller's "Reminiscence of Sicily" may be passed over, but the fact that it may be worth chronicling. Mr. Dewing's fantasia is too graceful to be called feeble, but too slightly grasped to be handicapped with its position. Altogether more deserving of consideration is Mr. Blum's "Dance" in the small room, where also are medallions by St. Gaudens and Warner, a series of Venetian etchings, striking but without the maintenance of the vigorous directness they at first assert, by Otto Bacher, and a bust in marble of Emerson by D. C. French, of Concord, which looks very like the subject. We need return to the main gallery only to notice Mr. Quartley's "After the Rain"—a stretch of water over which wild-fowl are flying towards the foreground sedges; light is breaking through a leaden sky at the horizon, and the whole effect of the picture illustrates the title with admirable explicitness.

pa
w
of
ra
it
th
be
th
U
3
le
of
su
co
on
ta
nu
be
th
ot
m
6
ex
to
tic
I
th
w
as
of
6
ce
bu
us
ra
st
m

so
att
paid
char
char
thel
lous
Den
ed o
num
conf
shal
of C
it s
mine

of N
he v
Terr